

Solicitors' Journal & Reporter.

LONDON, MAY 24, 1879.

CONTENTS.
JOURNAL.

CURRENT TOPICS:—

The Proposed Increase to the Fees of Court.....	577
Appeals from Interlocutory Orders	577
Costs of Three Counsel.....	577
Probate and Legacy Duty	578
An Incident at the Rolls Court	578
The Queen's Birthday	578

LEADERS:—

The Apportionment Act, 1870	578
Assignment of Policies of Marine Insurance	579
REVIEWS	581
GENERAL CORRESPONDENCE.....	585
CASES OF THE WEEK	583
SOCIETIES.....	586
OBITUARY.....	588
APPOINTMENTS, ETC.....	598
LEGISLATION OF THE WEEK.....	588
COURT PAPERS	589
LONDON GAZETTES, &c., &c.	590

NOTES OF CASES.

Ex parte Chick	583
Gee v Mahood.....	584
In re Nightingale	584
Adair v. Young	584
Vaughan v. The Owners of the "Castlopeia".....	584
In re The Bentham Mills Spinning Company	584
Peobles v. Herwood	585
In re Fieher	585
Robinson v. Chadwick	585
Backhouse v. Horsey	585
In the Matter of a Clergyman	585
Ryan v. Nesbitt.....	586
Kenton v Owen	586

REPORTS.

Birmingham Canal Company v. Cartwright (Ch.Div. Fry, J.)	598
Brown v. Smith (App.)	598
Burton v. O'Neill (App.)	592
Davey v. Shannon (Ex.Div.)	599
Forest of Dean Coal Mining Company, In re (Ch.Div. M.R.)	594
Hardley's Trusts, In re (App.)	587
Harker, In re. Goodbarne v. Fothergill (App.).....	587
Hossey v. Horne Payne and wife (H.L.)	585
Patey v. Flint (No. 2) (Ch.Div. Fry, J.)	595
Richmond v. White (Ch.Div. V.C.H.)	599
Rosewear Clay Company, Ex parte. In re Cook (App.)	591
Ruston v. Tobin (App.)	583
West of England and South Wales District Bank, In re The ..	
Ex parte The Swansea Royal Friendly Society (Ch.Div. Fry, J.,	
sitting for V.C.M.)	596
Woodard v. Billericay Highway Board (Ch.Div. M.R.)	593

To CORRESPONDENTS.—All letters intended for publication in the "Solicitors' Journal" must be authenticated by the name of the writer. The Editor cannot undertake to return MSS. forwarded to him.
Subscribers can have their Volumes bound at the Office—cloth, 2s. 6d., half law calf, 5s.

CURRENT TOPICS.

MR. HERSCHILL expressed a rather wide-spread feeling of anxiety when he asked in the House of Commons on Monday what was likely to be the amount of the annual sum to be levied on suitors under the Courts of Justice Building Act, 1865, Amendment Bill. We drew attention some weeks ago to the proposal in the Bill to increase the fees and percentages in the High Court of Justice and the Court of Appeal by such an amount as will represent an annual sum equal to six per cent. upon the balance advanced out of public money for the completion of the buildings; this increase of fees and percentages to continue for twenty-five years. It appears from Sir H. Selwin-Ibbetson's answer that the amount to be charged may be approximately stated at some £35,000 a year; but he added that it would be impos-

sible as yet to say what percentage of increase on present fees would result. We think we can indicate roughly what the percentage of increase is likely to be. It appears from various returns which we analysed last year (22 SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 328) that the actual amount of the annual fees received in all the offices of the Supreme Court may be set down at somewhere about £384,000. Assuming, therefore, that the amount to be charged is £35,000 a year, the proposed increase will be under ten per cent. on the existing scale.

THE EFFECT of the classification of appeals as appeals from interlocutory orders and appeals from final orders has been lately commented on in the Court of Appeal at Westminster as, in some respects, unsatisfactory. Interlocutory matters are put into a separate list and this list is taken once a week, and gone through until it is exhausted. This is obviously necessary with regard to matters really interlocutory, in the sense that they are collateral matters incidental to the procedure in an action. Such matters require to be decided promptly, and this would be impossible if they were put into the general list of appeals. But a great many matters are in form interlocutory which, in substance, are not like these incidental matters to which we refer, and have no claim to be put forward at the expense of the cases in the general list of appeals. For instance, the recent case of *The Queen v. The Bishop of Oxford*, which lasted a week, was taken as an interlocutory matter because in form it arose on a rule for a *mandamus*. A case such as this is not really interlocutory at all. It is as well capable of waiting as any of the cases in the general list of appeals. Similarly, with regard to new trials, an order making absolute a rule for a new trial is treated as an interlocutory matter. But such a matter is not interlocutory in the sense that orders with regard to discovery, interrogatories, and such things, are interlocutory matters. The discharge of such an order is really a final order in many cases. It seems to us desirable that those who prepare the lists of the Court of Appeal should have power to discriminate in regard to the question of what interlocutory matters are to go into the interlocutory list, and what into the general list, and that only those matters should go into the former list that are, in substance, as well as form, interlocutory.

THE QUESTION of the allowance of the costs of three counsel was before the Court of Appeal on Wednesday in a case of *Robinson v. Chadwick*; and, as will be seen from the note we print elsewhere, a rather important intimation was given. The rule stated by the taxing masters and indorsed by Vice-Chancellor Bacon in the case of *In re Lafitte* (24 W. R. 7), was that, in order to obtain the costs of three counsel, "there must not only be importance of value, but also an unusual quantity of evidence, and an unusual call upon the time of the counsel from the length of the hearing." To this rule the Court of Appeal, on Wednesday, appear to have added another, also previously suggested by the same Vice-Chancellor in a case of *Stanton v. Baring* (*Weekly Notes*, 1875, p. 188), that on the question of fact, whether a case is or is not of this description, the decision of the taxing master is final. So at least we understand the observations of the judges. The Master of the Rolls is reported to have said that the court ought not to interfere with the discretion of the taxing master unless "some question of law or of principle was involved"; and Lord Justice James appears to have gone so far as to say that, "So far as he was concerned such appeals [i.e., appeals such as that before the court, on matters of discretion] should never succeed." In *Robinson v. Chadwick* the action was one of seventy-seven brought against the defendant, and was selected as a test action. If the rule last year laid down by Mr. Justice Fry that the costs of three counsel should always

be allowed, "whenever a reasonable man, acting with reasonable prudence, would not venture to go into court without three counsel," be correct, there would seem to have been a good deal to be said in favour of allowing the costs of three counsel in the recent case.

WE CONFESS we do not see the force of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's objection to Mr. Dodds' proposal to substitute for probate and legacy duties one duty only, to be levied at a uniform rate upon the value of the personal estate of every deceased person. Mr. Dodds estimated the rate per cent. of this tax required to produce the present amount as four per cent.; and the Chancellor of the Exchequer's argument against the proposal was that "this would be to place a very heavy charge upon successors to property, who probably would, in many cases, not find it very convenient to bear it." We take it, however, that Mr. Dodds' proposal was that the duty should be paid by the executor, just as probate duty is now paid. Looking at the matter from the point of view both of the public revenue and of the successor, we should have thought that benefit would result from the simplification of the present system of double payment in probate and legacy duty. A large part of the present staff at Somerset House might be dispensed with and the whole duty would probably be sooner paid than at present; trouble and expense would be saved to executors and successors, and it would, of course, be open to a testator to regulate for himself the amount of the duty to be paid by each beneficiary under his will. The decision of the House was, however, against Mr. Dodds' proposal, but Mr. Gregory succeeded in passing a resolution affirming that it is expedient to "reconsider and revise the progressive rates of probate and administration duty, and to afford greater facilities for the assessment and settlement of legacy and succession duties upon future or contingent events, and for the relief of executors, administrators, and trustees in respect of the same." The inequality of the progressive rates of probate duty on small and large estates is undeniable. As Mr. Dodds pointed out, while thirty estates of £1,000 each pay probate duty to the amount of £900 between them, a single estate of the value of £30,000 pays only £450 of probate duty. This inequality will now probably be remedied. As to the other matters referred to in his resolution, Mr. Gregory proposes that executors and trustees should be empowered to give notice to the Inland Revenue Office that they are about to divide any fund in their hands, and inquire if such office has any claim for duties upon it, and if no such claim is made within a reasonable time, that such executors or trustees should be exonerated from personal liability to any future claim; that where a legacy is left to one person for life or for a limited interest, with remainder to another, the executor or trustee should have power to pay the duty upon the entire interest in such legacy in one amount, and that where there has been unreasonable delay on the part of the office in enforcing a claim for succession duty against an estate, or the trustees of it, say, for ten or fifteen years, the beneficial owner should not be liable to pay interest for the duty during that period, but the principal only.

AN ANCIENT SAW, relating to the results of referring to a personage supposed at the time to be distant, was illustrated at the Rolls on Tuesday last. The learned Master of the Rolls, in the course of a case relating to infringement of a design, had just been remarking that no decision of the English courts was reported on the point before him, while there appeared to be numerous decisions of the American judges directly bearing upon it. Hereupon a gentleman came into court, sent up his card, and was requested to take a seat on the bench. After shaking hands with the visitor, the Master of the Rolls announced that he was

Mr. Justice Treat, an American judge, and at once proceeded to avail himself of the legal knowledge of the assessor so opportunely and unexpectedly provided.

THE LEARNED MASTER OF THE ROLLS is immovable in his resolution not to enforce on suitors the recollection of the birthday of her Majesty in the same way as little boys used to be reminded of parish boundaries—viz., by punishing them severely. In answer to an appeal made by the leading counsel of his court on Thursday, the learned judge again declined to imitate the example of his brethren of the Appeal Court, and of the Chancery Division, and the majority of the judges of the common law divisions, and to close his court on Saturday. He repeated his remark, made on a similar occasion last year, that if the judges chose to make a rule authorizing the courts to be closed on her Majesty's birthday, he should be content to obey such rule, but, although he had no more dislike to a holiday than other people, he should consider it his duty, until such a rule was made, to keep his court open on the Queen's birthday. Would it not be as well that a rule should be made one way or the other?

THE APPORTIONMENT ACT, 1870.

I.

THE recent case of *The Swansea Bank (Limited) v. Thomas* (27 W. R. 491) deserves careful consideration. The defendant Thomas was the trustee in liquidation of the lessee of a house, and paid rent for the house at the Michaelmas quarter-day. Failing in an attempt to disclaim the lease as onerous, Thomas assigned over before the next quarter-day; and the question in the recent case was whether Thomas was liable to the reversioners, the Swansea Bank, for the whole or any part of the rent for the quarter during which his interest in the premises ceased. It was contended for the bank that Thomas was liable to them for rent up to the time when he left, on the ground that the case came within the Apportionment Act, 1870. The Exchequer Division took this view, and held that the bank was clearly entitled to recover from Thomas an apportioned part of the rent for the part of the quarter during which he had been in possession. In other words, they held that the effect of the Apportionment Act, 1870, is to enable a landlord to recover apportioned rent from an assignee of the term who has assigned over during a current quarter or half year.

Now, it must be admitted at once that the words of section 2 of the Apportionment Act, 1870, that "From and after the passing of the Act all rents . . . shall, like interest on money lent, be considered as accruing from day to day, and shall be apportionable in respect of time accordingly," are wide enough to bear the construction the court has placed upon them; but there is a familiar rule of construction of Acts of Parliament which it may be worth while to apply to the recent case. Let us try to ascertain with what the Apportionment Act, 1870, was dealing.

The Act recites that rents and some other periodical payments are not at common law apportionable (like interest on money lent) in respect of time; and for remedy of some of the mischiefs and inconveniences thereby arising divers statutes have been passed, which are then enumerated. The first of these is 2 Geo. 2, c. 19. By section 15 of this Act it is recited that where a lessor having only an estate for life in the lands, tenements, or hereditaments demised, happened to die before or on the day on which any rent was reserved, the rent or any part thereof was not by law recoverable by the executors or administrators of such lessor or landlord, nor was the person in reversion entitled thereto any other than for the use and occupation of such lands, &c., from the death of the tenant for life; and then the section gave to the executors of the

tenant for life a remedy against the lessee for the whole or a proportioned part of the rent, as the case might be. It is hardly necessary to observe that this provision relates to the case of a lease terminating with the life of the tenant for life.

The next statute (4 & 5 Will. 4, c. 22) dealt more at large with the subject. After reciting that, by law, rents, annuities, and other payments due at fixed or stated periods were not apportionable—from which it often happened that persons and their representatives, whose income was wholly or principally derived from these sources, by the determination thereof before the period of payment arrived, were deprived of means to satisfy just demands; and other evils arose from such rents, annuities, and other payments not being apportionable, which evils required remedy—it was enacted by section 2 that rents, annuities, &c., and all other payments coming due at fixed periods under any instrument executed after the passing of the Act should be apportioned in such manner that on the death of any person interested in such rents, &c., or on the determination, by any other means, of the interest of any such person, he or his representatives should be entitled to a proportion of such rents, &c., calculated up to the day of death or determination of interest. The Act gave all remedies at law and in equity to the person entitled to the apportioned part, but at the same time expressly provided that persons liable to pay rents should not be resorted to for the apportioned part, but that the entire rent should be paid to the person entitled to the last accruing portion of it, and then apportioned between the recipients.

The next statute recited in the Apportionment Act, 1870, (14 & 15 Vict. c. 25), relates to the case of leases or tenancies at a rack rent where the estate of the landlord entitled for his life or an uncertain interest determines; and as is well known, gives the tenant, instead of emblements, a right to continue his occupation till the expiration of then current year, the succeeding landlord being enabled to recover from the tenant a fair proportion of the rent up to the time of the tenant quitting. The statute 23 & 24 Vict. c. 154, also recited in the Act of 1870, contains a clause (section 49) as to the apportionment of rent in case of death where the lease has continuance; but as the Act relates only to Ireland it need not be noticed further.

It will be seen from this review of the prior statutes that two things were dealt with—the determination of a lease by the death of the tenant for life, and the apportionment between reversioners of continuing rents, and other periodical payments, reserved under an instrument in writing. This being so, the Apportionment Act, 1870, recites, as did the previous Act, that rents and other periodical payments are not at common law apportionable (like interest on money lent), in respect of time, and that for remedy of some of the mischiefs and inconveniences arising thereby, the Acts above-mentioned had been passed, and that it is expedient to remedy all such mischiefs. The Act then provides (section 2), as already stated, that after the passing of the Act rents, annuities, dividends, and other periodical payments in the nature of income (whether reserved or made payable under an instrument in writing or otherwise), shall, like interest on money lent, be considered as accruing from day to day, and shall be apportionable in respect of time accordingly. Referring back to 4 & 5 Will. 4, c. 22, to find the meaning of the expression “apportionable in respect of time,” we see that it there relates exclusively to the division of an entire rent, dividend, &c., between persons entitled to apportioned parts of it, and that the mischief to be remedied was only there partially dealt with—viz., in the case of matters arising out of some written instrument. The Act of 1870 has therefore much to which it can relate in the same direction as the previous Act. The previous Act did not effect apportionment as between heir and executor of a lessor seised in fee. It did not, according to Mr. Dart, apply as between vendor and pur-

chaser to affect the latter's right to accruing rents. It might be thought, therefore, that, as the Act of 1870 could be construed as merely extending the application of the previous Acts, there would be little reason for introducing an entirely new element; and it cannot be said that the remainder of the Act supplies any such reason. The third section provides that the apportioned part of a continuing rent, &c., shall be payable and recoverable when the entire portion shall become due. The section then deals with the case of a rent, &c., determined by re-entry or death, and provides that the apportioned part is to be payable when the entire portion would have been payable if the payment had not determined. Section 4 gives remedies at law and in equity for recovering the apportioned parts, such as the claimants would have for recovering the entire portions if they had been entitled to them. It contains, however, a proviso that persons liable to pay rents are not to be resorted to for apportioned parts of them, but the entire rent is to be recovered by the heir or other person who, if the rent had not been apportionable, would have been entitled to such entire rent, and the apportioned part is to be recoverable by the person entitled to it from such heir-at-law or other person. This obviously relates to liability to an entire rent, and not to the liability of two different persons to pay proportionate parts of it.

ASSIGNMENTS OF POLICIES OF MARINE INSURANCE.

THE case of *Pellus v. Neptune Marine Insurance Company* (L. R. 4 C. P. D. 139) is one of some importance to merchants and insurance companies. We cannot help thinking that if the decision is right there ought to be further legislation on the matter involved in that case. We feel very doubtful, moreover, whether one of the propositions contained in the judgment correctly represents the law. The decision itself was that in an action by the assignee of a policy of marine insurance, the insurers are entitled, by virtue of 31 & 32 Vict. c. 86, s. 1, to set off a debt incurred with them by the assured for premiums on policies effected with them by the assured prior to the date of the assignment. The statute referred to enacts that “whenever a policy of insurance on any ship, or on any goods in any ship, or on any freight, has been assigned so as to pass the beneficial interest in such policy to any person entitled to the property thereby insured, the assignee of such policy shall be entitled to sue thereon in his own name, and the defendant in any action shall be entitled to make any defence which he would have been entitled to make if the said action had been brought in the name of the person by whom, or for whose account, the policy sued upon was effected.” It was contended at the trial before Lord Coleridge, C.J., for the plaintiff, that the words “any defence” in the statute meant a defence arising on the policy itself, and did not include any defence, such as set-off, which arose *dehors* the policy altogether. On the other hand it was contended that the object of the enactment was, as its title expresses, to enable the assignee of the policy to sue in his own name, instead of as theretofore in the name of the assignor, but not to alter the law in any other respect. We think that there is a great deal to be said for the argument in favour of the plaintiff, notwithstanding the decision; but, on consideration of the case, it will be seen that it is of no great value as a precedent, because the point will probably never arise again in the same form, and the decision at present leaves matters in a most unsatisfactory state for that reason. This arises from the fact that the true point was not open to the plaintiff.

It was urged for the plaintiff, in addition to the argument above referred to, that, inasmuch as it is settled law that an action for a loss, even though a total loss, on a marine policy is an action for unliquidated

damages, there could be no right of set-off, because, unless in bankruptcy, there is no right of set-off except in respect of debts or liquidated demands on both sides. It appears to us that the law as to what damages are unliquidated and what liquidated is far from satisfactory to any reasonable mind. It is clear law that the damages on a *quantum meruit* are liquidated on the principle *id certum est quod certum reddi potest*. It cannot, therefore, be said that wherever the jury have to estimate the amount of damages, the damages are unliquidated. We cannot see the distinction in point of principle between damages on a policy of marine insurance and on a *quantum meruit*. It both cases the jury have to estimate an undetermined value. It might be logical to say that wherever the breach of contract is non-payment of a sum of money, whether ascertained or not, that is a case of liquidated damages or of debt; or to say that wherever the amount has to be fixed by the jury the damages are unliquidated, but the present state of the law is not logical. This question cannot be of much general interest since the Judicature Act has provided for counter-claims as well as set-off. The law, however, is as the plaintiff's counsel contended, but the point we are now dealing with was not taken at the trial, and, therefore, the court declined to treat it as open to the plaintiff.

It is clear, therefore, that the point actually decided in *Pellus v. The Neptune Marine Insurance Company* is not likely to occur again, and the decision is unsatisfactory, because it leaves open, to some extent, the question what might have been the result if, instead of pleading a set-off, the defendant had pleaded a counter-claim. The judgment (which was that of Denman and Lopes, J.J.) expresses an opinion as to the result, though that opinion can hardly be looked on as more than a *dictum*. It says:—"If it had been pleaded as a counter-claim we think it would have come within the words 'any defence' in the Act." Now, we feel a great difficulty about this, and this difficulty, when it comes to be dealt with, applies, though not so strongly, to the decision of the point actually decided in *Pellus v. The Neptune Marine Insurance Company*. This it is which led us to say that there seemed to be a great deal in the argument that "any defence" meant any defence arising on the policy. It seems difficult, looking to the scope of the present provisions as to counter-claim, to think that "any defence" can have been intended to include a right of counter-claim which did not exist, it must be remembered, at the time when 31 & 32 Vict. c. 86, was passed. In theory, at least, a defendant who is sued may counterclaim in respect of any matter, however wide of, or unconnected with, the original claim. If a man is sued for a debt, he can apparently counterclaim in respect of an assault (see ord. 19, r. 3). Now, can it possibly have been intended that the words "any defence" should have such a wide scope as to admit of any counter-claim that may exist between the underwriter and the assignee of the policy? A judge may exclude a counter-claim which cannot conveniently be tried with the claim. This introduces a further difficulty again, supposing a counter-claim to be included in a "defence." We cannot think that a counter-claim, properly so called, is really "a defence" in strictness at all, though it may popularly be termed so sometimes. It is equivalent to a statement of claim in a cross-action. There are so-called counter-claims—as, for instance, in respect of an equity really displacing the legal right—which are truly defences. But a counter-claim in respect of a wholly different transaction is not really a defence at all within the proper meaning of the term. The heading of the statement of the defendant, when it includes a counter-claim, is statement of defence and counter-claim. But when one has got thus far, it seems as if the same difficulty really arose in calling a set-off a defence. It is really a cross-claim.

It seems to us that, if the judgment is right, the Act does not go far enough, and the logical tendency of the

provision already made is towards further development in the same direction. The tendency of the Act is to make the policy on goods a sort of accessory to the right of property in the goods. The value of goods afloat depends, to some extent, on whether they are insured or not, and that value ought to depend on ascertainable elements, not on the unknown relations between the underwriter and the original insurer. The right of indemnity in respect of the loss of the goods can only really belong to their owner for the time being. The true policy seems to be to enable the contract of indemnity to follow the ownership of the goods. If this is to be effectively done it is obviously absurd that altogether extraneous claims arising against a person who once was, but no longer is, the person interested in the contract of indemnity should be allowed to be set up in answer to an action upon it. It would be as reasonable to say that an assignee of a bill of lading might be met, in an action against the shipowner upon the bill of lading, by a plea of some entirely extraneous claim which the shipowner might have had against the original shipper or consignee. The terms of the Bills of Lading Act are different from those of the 31 & 32 Vict. c. 86, but it seems to us that, in substance, the inexpediency of subjecting the assignee of the policy of marine insurance to all claims that might exist between the underwriter and the original insurer is similar to that which would arise if the law was as above described with respect to bills of lading. If the view expressed by the Common Pleas Division be correct, the purchaser of goods can never know to what extent he is really covered by the policy assigned to him, or how to estimate the value of the goods as insured, because practically he may or may not be insured at all, or he may be only partially insured. If the decision is right, we cannot think that the law is satisfactory. It was argued that there was no hardship, because the assignee of the policy might have given notice of the assignment. But that could only protect him as to claims accruing subsequently to the notice. There might be counter-claims in respect of matters accruing previous to the notice.

In the American case of *State v. Linkhaw* (69 N. C. 214), it was held that if a conscientious man, taking part in public worship, so manages his singing exercises as to throw everything into confusion, he is not indictable for persevering in his efforts, against remonstrances, his intention being not to disturb the congregation, but only to discharge his duty and obey his conscience thereby.

On Saturday evening Mr. Dickinson, Q.C., was entertained to dinner at the Albion on the occasion of his retirement from the Chancery bar. Mr. Eddis, Q.C., occupied the chair, and among those present were Mr. Osborne Morgan, Q.C., M.P., Mr. A. G. Martin, Q.C., M.P., Mr. Westlake, Q.C., Mr. Chitty, Q.C., Mr. Horace Davy, Q.C., Mr. Ince, Q.C., Mr. Graham Hastings, Q.C., Mr. Horton Smith, Q.C., Mr. Waller, Q.C., Mr. Roxburgh, Q.C., Mr. Bagshawe, Q.C., Mr. W. F. Robinson, Q.C., Mr. E. E. Kay, Q.C., Mr. Joshua Williams, Q.C., Mr. Montagu Cookson, Q.C., Mr. Mackeson, Q.C., Mr. William Pearson, Q.C., Mr. Romer, Mr. Rigby, Mr. Holland, Mr. Crossley, Mr. Ingle Joyce, Mr. Hornell, and Mr. Cecil Russell. Covers were laid for 114 guests.

In an "Index of Municipal Offices," compiled by Mr. G. L. Gomme for the Index Society, the following offices are enumerated:—"Aleconner, bellman, bread-weigher, aulnager, beaconer, bearward, bellingier, billet master, blower of the burghmote horn, bridge sweeper, brook warden, claviger, cleaner of the castle walks, cleaner of chandelier in town hall, coal meter, conduit warden, cook, corn measurer, corn prizer, town corporal, deacon of the shambles, dog whipper, egg collector, fen revee, fish taster, gasher of hides, haymaker, hayward, hog driver, horn blower, keeper of the pans and pumps, bucket keepers, mole catcher, moormen, and mossmen, presenter of butchers, quickener of the city's tenants, sample man, swine catcher, tender of the town wood, and weeder of footpaths."

Reviews.

COMPARATIVE JURISPRUDENCE.

THE ARYAN HOUSEHOLD: ITS STRUCTURE AND ITS DEVELOPMENT; AN INTRODUCTION TO COMPARATIVE JURISPRUDENCE. By WM. EDWARD HEARN, LL.D. LONGMAN, GREEN, & Co.

This interesting work is the production of a learned professor in the University of Melbourne. It deals in a comprehensive way with the early society of the Aryan races, and its transition into a political form, the materials being largely drawn from Indian law, and much of the substance being suggested by Sir Henry Maine's works. From the purpose of the book, which is accurately described as an introduction to the subject generally, we are not surprised to find the author proceed upon broad and definite lines without greatly encumbering his pages with controversy. For instance, he adopts, in a very absolute manner, the view of the fundamentally religious character of the primitive family. The work, however, shows ample evidence of wide acquaintance with diversified materials, and of the independence of judgment which springs from such knowledge.

We confess to a doubt whether, so far as regards early Aryan social institutions, the existing results of inquiry are such as to admit of being with advantage summarized for the purposes of instruction, except in a very general way; and to a further doubt how far we are in a position to say that any one custom, or institution, is purely Aryan. The latter question Dr. Hearn sets altogether to one side. By the former objection we do not wish to imply that his book is not one which will be of great use to persons who propose to themselves to pursue their investigations further; for them we think it contains little which will not, by suggestion or otherwise, be valuable; but we should be inclined to, in some degree, regret the adoption of the subject at present as a substantial part of a course of general educational study. Except in the merest outline, it appears to us to be yet in the stage of research.

Two of the most interesting chapters in the book are those relating to the law and custom of property, and the rise of civil jurisdiction. The problem of the origin of respect for property is very clearly dealt with, upon the theory that it arose out of the sentiment of religion, connected with the worship of the household. We concur altogether in part of this, namely, that, as the author well expresses it, "the habit . . . of respect for property was generated by the system of the household, and that it acquired under that system sufficient strength to stand alone when the originating force was withdrawn." We are not convinced that the respect for another's property was due to the respect for the house spirits that guarded that property, which is the other part of Dr. Hearn's contention. The evidence appears to us rather to indicate that religious sentiment supported the observance of the rights of property mainly as between persons who recognized the same god having jurisdiction in the matter—the same Hercules or Terminus. A stranger would not, as we understand, stand in awe of the ancestral spirits of a family; the guardianship of the family property by the *lares* is more likely to have been intended to be exercised by vigilance and information than by superstitious terrors—

Exagitant et lar et turba Diania fures;
Pervigilantque lares, pervigilantque canes.

We admit, however, that this function of the Roman *lares* may fairly be used as an argument, so far as it goes, by Dr. Hearn.

The chapter dealing with the rise of civil jurisdiction is an excellent one. One point very well brought out is the gradual rise of the authority of the State in matters of litigation, which, in the first instance, lay, and assumed to lie, only in the consent of the parties. This suggests

a partial truth which was contained in the theory of the social contract, upon which Dr. Hearn makes some observations in the introduction to his volume. Another observation in the same chapter illustrates the utter remoteness of modern theories of the State from that which such an association bears in primitive society. "The first interference of the State seems to have been directed towards these (the gentile religious) rites. . . . When any new worship was introduced . . . the whole force of the community was directed to repress the common enemy, and the State did not hesitate to repel a danger that seemed to threaten as well itself as all its subjects." This is, perhaps, too strongly put; what is undoubtedly true, however, is that the care of the worship of the common gods was one of the most important functions of an early State; and it would have been the duty of the common body to oppose religious innovations which seemed to conflict with the State worship. This would not, however, be of necessity presumed of a new religion.

With reference to primitive religion, the author discusses, as usual with much intelligence, the difficult question of the dissociation or severance of the connection between special deities and their worshippers. It is not, however, clear to our mind how he brings the capacity for this severance to follow from the conception of property in a deity. This use of the term property is metaphorical; it does not import all the legal incidents of modern property. In fact we are not satisfied that the notion of the alienability of private gods can co-exist with genuine belief in them. Local gods, and especially local idols, which are physically removable, do, of course, readily admit of the conception. In the case of other special deities we should be disposed to regard their abandonment as an expression of disbelief, the possibility of which would be incompatible with the relation between them and their worshippers while it existed.

Dr. Hearn writes in a flexible and workmanlike style, disturbed only at rare intervals by a rhetorical vein, or by such false humour as "lawyers still look with respectful admiration upon the first purchaser."

CROWN OFFICE.

THE TAXATION OF COSTS IN THE CROWN OFFICE, COMPRISING A COLLECTION OF BILLS OF COSTS IN THE VARIOUS MATTERS TAXABLE IN THAT OFFICE, &C., TOGETHER WITH A TABLE OF COURT FEES, &C. BY FREDERICK H. SHORT, Chief Clerk in the Crown Office. Stevens & Haynes.

The recent revision of the old scale of costs in the Crown Office renders the appearance of this work particularly opportune, and it cannot fail to be welcomed by practitioners. Mr. Short gives, in the first place, a scale of costs usually allowed to solicitors on the taxation of costs in the Crown Office, and then bills of costs in various matters. These are well arranged and clearly printed. Prefixed to the forms are some useful practical observations, among other matters, upon bankruptcy prosecutions under section 16 of the Debtors Act, 1869, the costs in which are taxed in the Crown Office. As to these, Mr. Short remarks that "the solicitor should bear in mind that he is acting only as an agent, and no costs will be allowed for any proceedings out of the ordinary course of the prosecution, unless the sanction of the Solicitor to the Treasury has been previously obtained. For instance, the costs of . . . going into the country to get up evidence, expenses of arresting absconding bankrupts, either abroad or in this country, and expenses incurred after the advice of counsel that the evidence is not sufficient to warrant a conviction, have been disallowed, upon the ground that the various steps had not been sanctioned by the Solicitor to the Treasury."

THE MAYOR'S COURT.

THE JURISDICTION, PROCESS, PRACTICE, AND MODE OF PLEADING IN ORDINARY ACTIONS IN THE MAYOR'S COURT, LONDON. FOUNDED ON BRANDON. By GEORGE CANDY, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Sons.

Mr. Candy has had the use of the materials to be found in the *Epitome of Practice* published by the present assistant judge of the Mayor's Court, and in part 2 of the present work he has succeeded in producing a very clear and practical guide to the procedure of that court. As it appears that in 1877 over 10,000 actions were entered in the Mayor's Court, the author's industry is not likely to go unrewarded; and in case his work reaches a second edition we would suggest the advisability of a considerable abridgment of part 1. The case of *Manning v. Farquharson* (9 W. R. 107), for instance, which Mr. Candy thinks it "worth while to exhume, . . . for the purpose of a brief examination before it is finally consigned to the limbo of exploded law," might, we think, be finally re-interred, and a simple statement of the present law as to the ordinary jurisdiction of the court might well be substituted for the detailed statement of cases and the controversial tone characterizing this part of the work. But part 2, on the ordinary procedure of the Mayor's Court, seems to be very well done, and the book will doubtless be of much service to a considerable section of London practitioners.

ELEMENTARY WORKS.

A PRACTICAL HANDY-BOOK OF ELEMENTARY LAW By M. S. MOSELY, Solicitor. Second Edition, by E. B. BEDFORD. London: Butterworths. 1878.

The earlier parts of this little book show a not unpromising design, and a good deal of intelligence and judgment in the execution of it. The writer begins by introducing the legal apprentice to his office, and explaining in a familiar way, step by step, the ordinary papers and transactions which he will there become acquainted with. Then, unfortunately, an attempt is made to follow the articulated clerk's legal studies throughout his course, not merely with general advice and information on practical matters, but with a sort of running summary of the law itself. Of course, the statements made in this manner must, from their meagreness alone, be unsatisfactory. This part of the work had better not have been attempted at all, or, if attempted, should have been done more carefully.

ELEMENTARY VIEW OF THE PROCEEDINGS IN AN ACTION IN THE SUPREME COURT. FOUNDED ON "SMITH'S ACTION AT LAW." By W. D. J. FOULKES, Barrister-at-Law. Second Edition. Stevens & Sons; H. Sweet; W. Maxwell & Son.

There is little to be said as to this new edition of Mr. Foulkes's successful adaptation of Smith further than that the new rules and the important cases appear to have been carefully incorporated or referred to.

It was announced at the Thames Police Court, on Wednesday, that Mr. Thomas, the second clerk, had resigned his appointment, which he had held for many years.

On Friday week in the House of Commons, in reply to Mr. M. Lloyd, the Chancellor of the Exchequer said the report of the commissioners to whom the Criminal Code Bill was referred would be ready towards the end of next week. He should be anxious to have it laid on the table the moment it was ready.

One of the attendants engaged in cleaning the Leeds County Court on Thursday, found a quantity of loose blasting powder mixed with the heads of lucifer matches, some cotton wool containing fine powder, and three large bottles filled with blasting powder underneath the seat usually occupied by Mr. Mayhall, the high bailiff.

General Correspondence.

THE NEW RULES.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—The issue of a new batch of Rules of Court a short while ago gives me the opportunity of making one or two remarks on the careless way in which these rules are drawn, which, so far as I know, has not yet been adverted to in your valuable paper.

Instances will explain my meaning clearer than anything else.

One of these last rules was numbered ord. 5, r. 4a, and was as follows:—

"If, in any action commenced and pending in any one of the Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, or Exchequer Divisions of the High Court, the trial shall take place before a judge of another of the said divisions, the cause shall from that time be transferred to the division of which such judge is a member."

In June, 1877, a similar batch was issued, one of which was also numbered ord. 5, r. 4a, and was in the following terms:—

"Subject to the power of transfer, and subject also to the power of the Lord Chancellor by order from time to time otherwise to direct, every cause or matter which shall be commenced in the Chancery Division of the High Court shall be assigned to one of the judges thereof by marking the same with the name of such of the same judges as the plaintiff or petitioner may in his option think fit."

Now, it is obvious that the later of these two rules was not intended to abrogate the earlier, as the subject-matter of them is totally different. Why, then, should the unnecessary blunder be made of numbering them both by the same number and letter? This will inevitably lead to much confusion, both in citation, and, in case, as seems likely to be the fate of most of the rules, one of them is annulled, for it will be impossible to tell which is taken and which left.

The same mistake occurs as to ord. 36, r. 29a, of which there are two, referring to totally different things, one passed in July, 1876, and another in November of the same year, and which it is presumed are both intended to be operative and to stand together.

Again, where rules are annulled and new ones substituted for them, in some cases the new ones are numbered by the same numbers as the annulled ones, with the addition of a letter; in other cases, as is clearly right, the substituted rule is simply numbered the same as the one in place of which it stands.

Instances of the wrong method are frequent, as, e.g., ord. 4, r. 1a, annulling ord. 4, r. 1; ord. 35, r. 1a, annulling ord. 35, r. 1.

This also, I submit, will give rise to unnecessary confusion in reference.

Let us turn from form to substance. Ord. 19, r. 29, as originally drawn, and as now left, is as follows:—

"Where an action proceeds in a district registry, all pleadings and other documents required to be filed shall be filed in the district registry."

Ord. 19, r. 29a (Rules of Court, March 27, 1879), is as follows:—

"When a cause in the Chancery Division is proceeding in a district registry, all certificates of the chief clerk and taxing masters, and all affidavits and other documents (required to be filed) used in London before the judge in chambers, or before any taxing master or referee of the court, and not already filed in the district registry, shall be filed in the same office as they would have been filed in if the proceedings had originally commenced in London, and if the court or judge shall so direct, office-copies thereof shall be transmitted to the district registry." This second rule, I presume, includes "pleadings," as otherwise its place is not in an order of which the subject is pleading, but would have been properly in order 35, which deals with these subjects. In

any case it surely impliedly repeals a good deal of rule 29, which is left, and is quite unqualified in its terms, and the two inconsistent rules stand side by side to the great future perplexity of the profession. One would have thought a very little care would have obviated such a fruitful cause of mistake and difficulty.

But the method of procedure in the district registries is involved in even greater mystery and obscurity by the following provisions:—

Ord. 35, r. 1a, amongst other provisions, provides that, "Where an action proceeds in a district registry, final judgment shall be entered in such district registry, unless the judge at the trial, or the court, or a judge shall otherwise order."

This is without any further qualification; and yet, in the next rule, ord. 35, r. 2, we read:—

"Subject to the foregoing rules, where an action proceeds in the district registry, the judgment" (and this must include "final judgment"), "and all such orders therein as require to be entered, except orders made by the district registrar under the authority and jurisdiction vested in him under these rules, shall be entered in London, and, an office copy of every judgment and order, &c., shall be transmitted to the district registry to be filed with the proceedings in the action."

These two rules appear to be clearly inconsistent; and yet the former is passed subsequently to the latter without any modification of the latter being introduced.

We have been accustomed, Sir, to look for, and have almost got reconciled to, such inconsistencies and carelessness in Acts of Parliament subjected to the meddling amendments of amateur legislators in committee; and none so strongly as the judges have inveighed against these blunders and the cause of them. Here such an opportunity as they have never had has been offered them of building up a consistent and logical body of rules to govern the procedure of our courts. Will rules made like this be a monument of their success?

Surely, Sir, it is not too much to ask that when the judges do make new rules they should take care not to frame such as are, on the very surface, inconsistent with each other; and to expect that, when they bring to bear upon their task their unrivalled experience in the working of the rules, and the knowledge they have acquired of their deficiencies and mistakes, they should not introduce new difficulties when seeking to do away with old ones.

M.

Lincoln's-inn.

LEGAL MENDICANTS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—I have just seen Messrs. Challener & Son's letter, and it may perhaps interest them and your other readers to know that Willis, to whom they refer, is an old hand at his present trade. He honoured me with a visit some years ago, and I was weak enough to give—or, as he called it, lend—him a trifle. He is well acquainted with the Dorsetshire town of which he speaks; and, indeed, I had compassion on him, owing in some measure to his knowledge of persons there with whom I am acquainted. He subsequently went the round in Gloucestershire.

There are more persons than one following the same business just now. A person called on me not very long ago, and told me he was a son of a solicitor who formerly practised at Gloucester, and very touching was his story. For the truth of it he referred me to one or two members of the profession in this city. However, while he was urging his claims to consideration, a clerk informed me that one of the gentlemen to whom he had referred as acquainted with him was below, waiting to see me. The instant he heard the name, this worthy beggar bolted with a precipitation most amusing. I ought to have stopped him, but I thought it hardly worth while to do so.

W. J. HUMPHREYS.

Hereford, May 20.

Cases of the Week.

BANKRUPTCY—BENEFICED CLERGYMAN—SEQUESTRATION—PRIORITY—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1869, s. 88.—In a case of *Ex parte Chick*, before the Court of Appeal on the 15th inst., a question arose as to the priority of two sequestrations which had been issued against the profits of the benefice of a bankrupt clergyman on behalf of his creditors in two different bankruptcies. The question turned upon the construction of section 88 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1869, which enables the trustee to apply for a sequestration, and enacts that the sequestration shall accordingly be issued, "and shall have priority over any other sequestration issued after the commencement of the bankruptcy, except a sequestration issued before the date of the order of adjudication by or on behalf of a person who at the time of the issue thereof had not notice of an act of bankruptcy committed by the bankrupt and available against him for adjudication." The bankrupt, a benefited clergyman, was adjudicated a bankrupt under the Bankruptcy Act, 1861, in May, 1869, and on the 25th of November, 1869, he obtained an order of discharge. At the time when that adjudication was made, and for some years afterwards, the profits of the benefice were absorbed by some sequestrations which had been obtained on behalf of some judgment creditors. On the 6th of October, 1874, the bankrupt filed a liquidation petition, and on the 24th of December, 1874, he was a second time adjudicated a bankrupt, the adjudication being founded upon the act of bankruptcy committed in the filing of the liquidation petition. The sequestrations of the judgment creditors having become satisfied, or nearly satisfied, the assignee in the first bankruptcy on the 5th of November, 1874 (having then notice of the filing of the liquidation petition), issued a sequestration against the profits of the benefice, and in September, 1875, the trustee in the second bankruptcy issued a similar sequestration. The question was which of these two sequestrations was entitled to priority. It was admitted on behalf of the assignee in the first bankruptcy that, if the words of section 88 were to be read literally, the sequestration issued by the trustee in the second bankruptcy must have priority. But it was urged that the object and intent of the section was only to provide for an equal distribution of the profits of the bankrupt's benefice, like the rest of his assets, among the creditors who were entitled to prove in the particular bankruptcy, and to prevent individual creditors from obtaining a priority by means of sequestrations issued before that of the trustee, unless issued before the adjudication and without notice of an act of bankruptcy. The section had no application as between the creditors who were entitled to prove under different bankruptcies. The court (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.JJ.) ultimately adopted this view. Cotton, L.J., was of opinion that the provision as to the priority of the trustee's sequestration was intended to secure that the profits of the benefice should be applied rateably among the creditors entitled to prove under the bankruptcy, as if it were property which could be vested in the trustee, and to prevent any creditor, whose debt was provable under the bankruptcy, from obtaining a preference for himself to the prejudice of the other creditors; but that it was not in any way intended to affect the right or priority of the creditors under any other bankruptcy. Consequently the sequestration issued by the assignee in the first bankruptcy was entitled to priority. Brett, L.J., was of opinion that there was no reason for limiting the generality of the words of the section, and that they must be construed literally. James, L.J., agreed with Cotton, L.J. If the section was construed literally, then any sequestration issued by the bishop, not on behalf of a creditor, but for the purpose of compelling the clerk to reside and perform his spiritual functions, or of compelling him to repair the buildings belonging to the benefice, or for the purposes of Queen Anne's Bounty, must be postponed to a sequestration issued on behalf of the trustee in the bankruptcy of the clerk. This was a *reductio ad absurdum*, and it was clear that some limitation must be placed upon the words of the section; the literal meaning could not be given without going contrary to common sense and common justice. The only alternative was to limit the meaning by the general object and intention of the Act, which was to provide for the equal distribution;

the bankrupt's assets among those creditors who could prove in the bankruptcy.

WILL—CONSTRUCTION—ANNUITY—CORPUS OR INCOME.—On the 16th inst. the Court of Appeal reversed the decision of Hall, V.C., in *Gee v. Mahood* (26 W. R. 789, L. R. 9 Ch. D. 151). A testator gave the residue of his real and personal estate to trustees, and empowered them to sell the same, and to invest the proceeds, and then "to set apart a sufficient portion of such investments as will produce the annuity of £1,200, which I bequeath to my wife for her life." And, subject to such investment in favour of his wife, in trust to set apart £5,000, other part thereof, for his daughter. And, as to the entire residue of his said trust estate, and also as to that part thereof set apart in favour of his wife after her death, upon certain other trusts. The yearly income of the trust estate did not amount to £1,200, and Hall, V.C., held that the widow was not entitled to have the deficiency raised out of the corpus of the trust estate. The Court of Appeal (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.J.J.) held that she was.

PRACTICE—ADMINISTRATION ACTION—DETERMINATION OF ISSUE AT HEARING.—In a case of *In re Nightingale*, before the Court of Appeal on the 16th inst., the action was for the administration of a testator's estate. The statement of claim stated a question of law, which was, in fact, the only matter in issue between the parties. The defendants at the hearing asked Bacon, V.C., to decide this question at once, and thus obviate the necessity of sending the case into chambers for the ordinary accounts and inquiries. His lordship refused to do this, and made an administration decree. The Court of Appeal (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.J.J.) held that the defendants' request ought to have been acceded to, and they heard and determined the question of law.

PATENT—INFRINGEMENT—LIABILITY OF MASTER OF SHIP.—In a case of *Adair v. Young*, before the Court of Appeal on the 17th inst., a question arose as to the position of the master of a ship with reference to the infringement of a patent by means of user on board the ship. The plaintiffs' patent was for an improvement in ships' pumps, and the action was brought in respect of an alleged infringement of it, the defendants being the manufacturers of pumps which were alleged to be an infringement, and the master of a British ship on which some of those pumps had been fitted. The ship was, when the action was commenced, lying in dock at Liverpool. The master had had nothing to do with the ordering or fitting of the pumps, but he had found them already in the ship when he took possession of her as master. The pumps had never been actually worked, except on one occasion, when the ship was not in British waters. When the master first received notice from the plaintiffs that the pumps were an infringement of their patent, he did not give up the names of the owners of the ship, but joined with the manufacturers in defending the action. Bacon, V.C., held that the plaintiffs' patent had been infringed, and granted an injunction against the manufacturers, and also against the master of the ship. The Court of Appeal (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.J.J.), unanimously affirmed the decision as to the manufacturers, but they differed as to the liability of the ship's master. Cotton, L.J., said that even an ordinary agent, if he used a patented article, would be liable to an action. But the master of a ship was not in the position of an ordinary agent; his possession of the ship was peculiar; he was more than a mere agent, and was certainly not a mere servant of the shipowners. It was not necessary to decide whether there had been any user of the pumps within British waters, for there had been an intention to use them. They were the only pumps on board the ship when she left British waters, and if in going out of port the ship had sprung a leak the master would have used the pump, and would have incurred a liability to the owners of the ship and to the owners of the cargo if he did not use the pumps in any case of necessity. The injunction had therefore been rightly granted against the master. Brett, L.J., agreed in this conclusion. He thought the case of the master a very hard one, and would decide in his favour if he could. There could be no doubt that the master was in possession of the ship and her equipments, and he had the control over everything on

board which was necessary for navigating the ship, and was the person to decide whether the pumps should be used or not. But he had no power to say whether he would or would not have the pumps on board, and as against the owners of the ship it would be a breach of his duty if he did not use them when necessary. If the pumps were actually worked the working was a user by him, as the person having the control of them. They had never in this case been actually worked in British waters, and his lordship could not hold that they had been used by the master merely because they were on board the ship. But, inasmuch as, after the ship came into port, she was still in his possession as master, and he did not refer the matter to the owners when he received notice from the plaintiffs, but in effect threatened, if not restrained by injunction, to use the pumps when he went to sea if occasion should arise, his lordship thought that the injunction had been rightly extended to him. James, L.J., said that an injunction ought not to be granted against any man unless it was shown that he had done or intended to do something unlawful, or had omitted to do something which he ought to have done. The pumps had not been put on board the ship by the master; when he came on board as master he found the pumps already fitted without any knowledge on his part of their nature. He had no power to take them out. In his lordship's opinion the master was not liable for the infringement of the patent, and an injunction ought not to have been granted against him when there could have been no difficulty in getting at the owners of the ship.

SERVICE OF WRIT—ADMIRALTY ACTION IN REM—AMENDMENT OF WRIT—SALE OF SHIP—MONEY IN COURT—SERVICE ON REGISTRAR—ORD. 19, r. 6.—In a case of *Vaughan v. The Owners of the Cassiopeia*, before the Court of Appeal on the 21st inst., a question arose as to the service of an amended writ in an admiralty action *in rem*. The original writ was issued by Vaughan & Co. against the defendants, claiming a sum of £700, which the plaintiffs alleged to be due to them for necessities supplied to the ship. It was served in the usual way on the ship, which was then under arrest in another action brought by other plaintiffs. Afterwards the writ was amended by leave of the court by adding one of the partners in the plaintiffs' firm as a co-plaintiff, a mortgage of some shares in the ship having been made to him, as a trustee for the firm, to secure the £700. The amended writ was served on the registrar of the court, the ship having been meanwhile sold in the other action, and the proceeds of the sale having been paid into court. The defendants not having appeared, the plaintiffs moved for judgment by default. The judge of the Admiralty Division refused the application, on the ground that the amended writ had not been properly served. It was not, however, brought to his lordship's attention that the ship had been sold before the amendment of the writ. This fact was mentioned to the Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Brett, L.J.J.), and they held that service of the amended writ was necessary, and that the service on the registrar, who had the custody of the money, was the proper, and, indeed, the only mode of service possible under the circumstances. And they gave judgment for the plaintiffs.

COMPANY—BANKRUPT SHAREHOLDER—DEBT DUE FROM BANKRUPT TO COMPANY—RIGHT OF TRUSTEE TO BE REGISTERED—COMPANIES ACT, 1862, TABLE A, CLAUSES 10, 13, 14.—In a case of *In re The Bentham Mills Spinning Company*, before the Court of Appeal on the 21st inst., a question arose as to the right of the trustee in bankruptcy of a bankrupt shareholder to call on the company to register him as the holder of the shares in place of the bankrupt, there being a debt due from the bankrupt (independently of the shares) to the company. The company was regulated by table A. in the Companies Act, 1862, of which clause 10 (which is one of a series of clauses headed "Transfer of Shares") provides that, "the company may decline to register any transfer of shares made by a member who is indebted to them." Clause 13 provides that "any person becoming entitled to a share in consequence of the death, bankruptcy, or insolvency of any member, or in consequence of the marriage of any female member, may be registered as a member upon such evidence being produced as may, from time to time, be required by the company." And clause 14 pro-

vides that "any person who has become entitled to a share in consequence of the death, bankruptcy, or insolvency of any member, or in consequence of the marriage of any female member, may, instead of being registered himself, elect to have some person to be named by him registered as a transferee of such share." These two clauses are part of a series of clauses headed "Transmission of Shares." Hall, V.C., held that the company were justified in refusing to register the trustee. The Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Brett, L.J.J.) held that clause 10 did not apply to the case of a transmission of shares by operation of law, and that the trustee was entitled to have his name registered in lieu of that of the bankrupt.

VENDOR AND PURCHASER—SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE—DESCRIPTION OF VENDOR IN CONTRACT—STATUTE OF FRAUDS.—In a case of *Peebles v. Henwood*, before the Court of Appeal on the 19th inst., the action was brought by vendors for the specific performance of a contract for the purchase of land, and the question arose whether the contract was a binding one within the Statute of Frauds. The contract was written upon some particulars of sale which had been prepared in contemplation of a sale of the property by auction on a former occasion, and it purported to be entered into between the purchaser and the "vendors." It appeared from the particulars that the vendors were the trustees under a will. When, however, the abstract of title was delivered to the purchaser it appeared that before the sale to him the property had been conveyed by the trustees to the beneficiaries under the will, and that they were the persons who were really selling, and who alone had power to sell the property. The contract for sale had been, after its execution, ratified in writing by the beneficiaries; but this had been done without the assent of the purchaser. Bacon, V.C., decreed specific performance of the contract at the suit of the beneficiaries. The Court of Appeal (James, Brett, and Cotton, L.J.J.) held that there was no binding contract within the Statute of Frauds, and dismissed the action, with costs.

PRACTICE—ACTION FOR RECOVERY OF LAND—LEAVE TO JOIN OTHER CAUSE OF ACTION—APPLICATION AFTER SERVICE OF WRIT—ORD. 17, R. 2—ORD. 57, R. 6.—In a case of *In re Fletcher*, before the Court of Appeal on the 21st inst., a writ was issued claiming the recovery of land, and joining also another cause of action, and was served on the defendant, without first obtaining the leave of the court under rule 2 of order 17, which provides that "no cause of action shall, unless by leave of the court or a judge, be joined with an action for the recovery of land." After service of the writ the plaintiff applied to Fry, J., for leave to combine the two causes of action. Fry, J., refused to give leave, on the ground that after service of the writ the application was too late, and the Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Brett, L.J.J.), affirmed the decision. Jessel, M.R., said that, strictly speaking, such an application ought to be made before the issue of the writ, but it must be made before service. Rule 6 of order 57, which enabled the court to enlarge or abridge the time appointed for doing any act or taking any proceeding, had no application to the case, and, if the court had any general jurisdiction to dispense with the rules, no special case, and indeed no case at all, had been shown for its exercise. Such slovenliness in practice ought not to be encouraged.

PRACTICE—SUMMONS UNDER VENDOR AND PURCHASER ACT, 1874—APPEAL—INTERLOCUTORY LIST.—On the 21st inst. application was made to the Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Brett, L.J.J.) that an appeal from an order made upon a summons under the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, might be set down in the list of interlocutory appeals, on the ground that the object of the Act was that matters of this kind should be quickly disposed of, and that, as a general rule, such appeals ought to be placed in that list, just as are appeals from orders made on demurrers, and from orders made in the winding up of companies. The court, however, refused to accede to the application.

COSTS—TAXATION—THREE COUNSEL.—In a case of *Robinson v. Chadwick*, before the Court of Appeal on the 21st inst., the action had been selected for trial as a test action out of seventy-seven brought by different plaintiffs against the same defendants, claiming damages for alleged misrepresentations which had induced the plaintiffs to take shares in the company. When the action came on for trial before Fry, J., the plaintiff declined to proceed, and judgment was given for the defendants, with costs. The defendants had retained three counsel, and upon the taxation of costs the taxing master allowed only the costs of two counsel. Fry, J., refused to vary the certificate, and the defendants appealed. It was urged that the case was one of great difficulty and complexity, and that regard should be had, not merely to the amount at stake in the particular action, but to the whole amount at stake in the seventy-seven actions. The Court of Appeal (Jessel, M.R., and James and Brett, L.J.J.) were of opinion that the circumstance that the action was a test one made no difference. Jessel, M.R., said that the action not having been tried, there was no judge who had had any opportunity of seeing what its nature was, and the taxing master, who had had the pleadings and the proofs of the witnesses before him, had had the best possible information. He had exercised his discretion, and there was no absolute rule as to the circumstances under which the cost of a third counsel would be allowed; the question was what, in the opinion of the person who had to exercise the discretion, was a case of such exceptional magnitude and complexity as to justify the allowance. The taxing master had refused to allow the cost of a third counsel, and the judge thought that he was right. There were no other materials before the Court of Appeal, and how could they say that the taxing master had not exercised a sound discretion? There was nothing in the pleadings to show that there was anything novel, extraordinary, or difficult in the case, and, so far as he could judge from the pleadings and the proofs, the Master of the Rolls thought that the taxing master was right. The court ought not to interfere with his discretion, unless some question of law or of principle was involved. Brett, L.J., said that, unless the judges of the Court of Appeal took great care, the day appointed for the hearing of interlocutory appeals on points of practice and matters of discretion would be the great blot in the new system. The court ought to discourage as much as possible appeals in cases of that kind. James, L.J., said that so far as he was concerned, such appeals would never succeed.

PRACTICE—MORTGAGEE—MOTION FOR RECEIVER—INTERIM INJUNCTION—EX PARTE ORDER AFTER NOTICE SERVED.—In a case of *Backhouse v. Hornsey*, before the Master of the Rolls on the 16th inst., a motion was made by an equitable mortgagee for a receiver, and the affidavit in support had not been filed when the motion was opened. The defendant, the mortgagor, had had no opportunity of answering such affidavit, and he now applied that the motion might stand over without his giving any undertaking. The subject-matter of the mortgage was a brickfield, and the plaintiff's affidavit alleged that the defendant was removing the clay and so diminishing the value of the security. There was no allegation to show that there would be any special damage to the security if the motion stood over for a week, or that the security was insufficient. The Master of the Rolls said that the law had not been altered, and that although the court might, no doubt, after notice, grant an interim injunction, still some special ground must be shown; and here no case had been made at all. The motion must stand over for a week, without any undertaking being required. Of course, when the motion came on after notice, an equitable mortgagee had only to produce his mortgage deed, his right to a receiver being indisputable.

CLERICAL DISABILITIES ACT, 1870—VACATION OF ENROLMENT—PROOF.—An application in the *Matter of a Clergyman*, was made to the Master of the Rolls, also on the 16th inst., to vacate a deed of relinquishment by him of his benefice under the following circumstances. It appeared from his affidavit that he had executed a deed of relinquishment under the Clerical Disabilities Act, 1870, s. 3, and that the same had been duly enrolled in chancery. The enrolment was more than six months before the date of the application, and no office copy of the enrolment had been

delivered to the bishop of the diocese according to the 3rd sub-section of section 3. No reason was stated why it was desired to vacate the inrolment, but the applicant relied on a case before Lord R. Milly, M.R., of *Ex parte A Clergyman* (L. R. 15 Eq. 154). The Master of the Rolls was of opinion that he had jurisdiction to make the order, but he refused to do so on the affidavit as then filed. On an affidavit being filed giving the name of the bishop in whose diocese the applicant's benefice was, and that the deed of inrolment had not been recorded in such diocese, he said the order might go.

TRUSTEES—BONA FIDE MISTAKE—COSTS.—In a case of *Ryan v. Nesbitt*, also before the Master of the Rolls on the 16th inst., a question arose as to whether trustees should pay the costs of an action rendered necessary because they had, on a mistaken interpretation of the settlement of which they were trustees, and which, in effect, in the events that had happened, gave the settlor the right to rescind the trusts, and acting as they alleged on the advice of counsel, refused to re-transfer the trust funds to the settlor. The Master of the Rolls, in ordering an immediate transfer, made no order as to costs, and added, "I will repeat what I have often said, that the court ought not to be too hard upon trustees who act *bona fide*, even if they make a mistake."

EVIDENCE—ADMISSIBILITY—DECLARATION OF DECEASED PERSON.—In a case of *Kenton v. Queen*, before Fry, J., on the 20th inst., a question arose as to the admissibility in evidence of a declaration made by a deceased person. The action was brought to recover some land which was in the possession of the defendant. The land had been comprised in the marriage settlement of the defendant's mother, the defendant being her youngest child. The plaintiff claimed to be the only child of the defendant's deceased elder brother. The defendant alleged that the plaintiff was illegitimate. In support of the plaintiff's legitimacy it was proposed to use a letter written by her deceased grandmother (the defendant's mother) in the year 1850. The defendant's counsel objected to the reception of this evidence, and in support of his objection tendered another letter written by the grandmother in the year 1854, for the purpose of showing that before the letter of 1850 was written the question of the plaintiff's legitimacy was in controversy between the members of the family, that, in fact, the letter of 1850 was written *post litem motam*. Fry, J., held that the letter of 1854 was inadmissible for the purpose proposed. It was not the ordinary sworn testimony upon which the court proceeded; it was not an admission, the grandmother not being a party to the action; it was not a declaration of a deceased member of the family as to a matter of pedigree; nor was it a declaration made by a deceased person against interest. To admit in evidence a subsequent declaration of a member of a family, who had already made a declaration as to pedigree, would involve this danger, that a declaration perfectly honest at the time when it was made might be set aside by the mere *ipse dixit* of the same person *post litem motam*. Of course, this rule would not apply to a case where the original declaration contained *in gremio* something which showed that there was a *lis mota* at the time when it was made, for the whole of the document must be looked at.

At the Marylebone Police Court on Monday Mr. De Rutzen was asked whether he would consider the point whether a solicitor could, as in the county court, obtain a summons without coming before the magistrate and making a personal application. Mr. De Rutzen said that, so far as he was concerned, he would at once say that he could not give his sanction to any such arrangement, for he considered it of the utmost importance in the interests of the public that the magistrate should know all the facts of the case and exercise his discretion as to whether a summons should issue or not. This, he might add, was one of the most useful powers a magistrate had in his hands.

VALUE OF PROPERTY IN CAMBERWELL.—Messrs. Rushworth & Co., of Savile-row, sold at the Mart, on Tuesday, a block of thirteen freehold houses in the Camberwell-road, producing £611 per annum, mostly on yearly tenancies, for the high price of £17,000, or nearly twenty-eight years' purchase on the rental, at which rate they would pay about three and a half per cent. only.

Societies.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

The annual general court was held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society, on Thursday last, Edward Tylee, Esq., in the chair. The following report was read and adopted:—

Your directors have the pleasure of submitting to the members of the association a report of their proceedings for the last twelve months. Your directors have considered thirty cases of the primary class, and have distributed amongst them the aggregate sum of £1,445. They have also considered the numerous applications of the secondary or non-members' class, which have come before them, and have distributed the sum of £150 placed at their disposal amongst seventeen cases. Your directors recommend to the general court that the sum of £150 be placed at their disposal for the cases of non-members for the ensuing year. Your directors have the pleasure to report that they have received towards the funds of the association two donations of £5 5s. each from the principal and ancients of Staple-inn. The annual dividends on the investments amounted to £1,305 8s. 7d. There are 251 annual subscribers, the amount received from whom for the past year has been £527 2s., which sum, added to the income derived from investments, makes a total income for the last year of £1,832 10s. 7d. Your directors report with regret the deaths of eight members during the past year. During the same period nine new members have joined the association, of whom two are life members, and seven are annual members. Your directors again urge upon every member of the association the importance of his explaining to his brethren of the profession, who are not already members, the advantage of upholding the association, as the best means of ministering to the necessities of those unfortunately left in needy circumstances. Your directors cannot close their report without expressing their deep sense of the loss they themselves, but still more the association, has sustained by the resignation of their much esteemed secretary, Mr. John Boodle, after holding the office with great advantage to the association for a period of upwards of twenty-two years. They however hope that Mr. Boodle's services will to some extent be continued to the association, by his being elected a director. They have also the pleasure to inform the annual general court that Mr. A. B. Carpenter, of Elm-court, Temple, has been elected secretary in the place of Mr. Boodle.

The directors and other officers were re-elected. A vote of thanks to the chairman, directors, and auditors terminated the proceedings.

LAW STUDENTS' DEBATING SOCIETY.

At the weekly meeting of this society, held at the Law Institution on the 20th inst., Mr. Ellis, LL.B., being in the chair, the following question was discussed:—"Is a creditor who has obtained a judgment against a limited company, and, by reason of the promises of the company, has forborne to issue execution until a petition to wind up the company has been presented by another creditor, and the company has admitted its insolvency, entitled to proceed with his execution and be paid in full?" The cases cited for reference being *Ex parte Railway Steel Company* (L. R. 8 Ch. D. 103) and *In re Printing and Numerical Registering Company* (L. R. 8 Ch. D. 535). The question was opened in the affirmative by Mr. Serjeant, who quoted several cases in support of this view, and the following gentlemen then addressed the society:—Mr. Royle and Mr. Seymour maintaining the affirmative, and Mr. Collins, Mr. Bower, Mr. Eady, LL.D., Mr. Green, and Mr. Heppell arguing that the creditor is not entitled to proceed with his execution. The opener replied, and the chairman, having summed up, put the question to the meeting, when it was decided in the negative.

UNITED LAW STUDENTS' SOCIETY.

A meeting was held at the Law Institution on Monday, the 19th inst., Mr. W. Dowson in the chair, when Mr. W. Owen read an interesting essay on "Conditions Precedent and Warranty," and a discussion followed, which was introduced by Mr. H. J. Gidney, on the following

question:—"A. sent some pigs, which he knew were suffering from disease, to market for sale, and sold them without giving any warranty or expressing any opinion as to their condition. Shortly after the sale the pigs died. Is the fact of sending the pigs to a public market a representation by conduct that they are free from disease, and is A. liable to make good the loss the purchaser sustained?" in which Messrs. Foà, Guppy, Eustace Smith, Kains-Jackson, and Hood took part. The chairman summed up, and upon the question being put to the vote was negatived unanimously.

The ordinary weekly meeting was held at Clement's-inn Hall on Wednesday last, Mr. Dowson in the chair, when Mr. Frank B. Moyle introduced the following subject in the negative:—"That the publication in the newspapers of the details of criminal and divorce cases should be prohibited," and was supported by Messrs. Parsons and Dowson. Messrs. Gressly and Symot spoke in the affirmative, and upon the question being put to the vote it was lost by a majority of seven.

UNITED LAW CLERKS' SOCIETY.

The forty-seventh annual festival of the United Law Clerks' Society was held on Wednesday last at the Freemasons' Tavern, Great Queen-street, the Right Hon. the Lord CHANCELLOR in the chair.

Amongst those present we observed Sir C. Shand, 1st Chief Justice of the Mauritius; Sir R. Couch, late Chief Justice of the Bengal District; H. Rodwell, Esq., Q.C., M.P., Serjeant Simon. M.P., C. Milward, Esq., Q.C., G. B. Gregory, Esq., M.P., H. Davey, Esq., Q.C., C. Russell, Esq., Q.C., B. Ince, Esq., Q.C., Eneas J. McIntyre, Esq., Q.C., O. H. Baylis, Esq., Q.C., H. M. Bompas, Esq., Q.C., F. Meadows White, Esq., Q.C., C. Clark, Esq., Q.C., R. E. Webster, Esq., Q.C., W. F. Robinson, Esq., Q.C., W. F. Bagshaw, Esq., Q.C., F. Turner, Esq., A. M. Channell, Esq., T. Hoskins, Esq., J. Layton, Esq., E. L. Rowcliffe, Esq., T. Rawle, Esq., F. O. Crump, Esq., J. H. Dart, Esq., T. H. Devonshire, Esq., R. A. Harting, Esq., M. Teesdale, Esq., W. M. Walters, Esq., E. W. Owles, Esq., J. T. Hollams, Esq., President of the Incorporated Law Society, R. Romer, Esq., F. Ouvry, Esq., F. T. Bircham, Esq., and many other eminent members of the legal profession, together with the Rev. A. Statham and Dr. Thompson.

The usual loyal and patriotic toasts having been given and duly honoured,

The CHAIRMAN, in rising to propose the toast of the evening, viz., "Prosperity to the United Law Clerks' Society," said:—"We are here to-night to do some business, and I propose to you now the toast of the evening. But you need not be alarmed, that does not at all mean that I am going to make you a long speech. When I was at the bar it always appeared to me that if you had a good case you ought to make a very short speech, because if you made a long one there was the danger that you would do your case some harm. Now I cannot help remembering, standing here to-night, that it is just eighteen years ago since I first had the honour of presiding at the anniversary festival of your society. I have never ceased to take a great interest in this society, and, what perhaps you may think more extraordinary is, that I take an interest in these dinners. I am not an admirer generally of what are called in London charity dinners, but it has always appeared to me that, with regard to the dinners of the United Law Clerks' Society, which have been going on now for nearly fifty years, there was a marked and special advantage. I said just now that all here were lawyers, and so we are. Now there are various departments of the law; there are solicitors of eminence who manage the most important affairs in this country and who conduct the litigation in our superior courts. There are the advocates, barristers who conduct the affairs of their clients in court and who advise upon them out of court. There are the clerks, both of the solicitors and the barristers, who do a work not so much seen, not so conspicuous, not so much talked of by the public, but a work which in its way is just as valuable as the other. From the judge on the bench who administers justice through all of these grades of the profession, all in their own way and in their own department are engaged in the one common work of administering and helping to administer justice in this country; and it has always

seemed to me that it was a great advantage that, at all events at one period of the year, there should at these dinners be an union of all these classes of the profession, that they might meet together, and might together express their sympathy and their interest in what concerns every branch of the profession. Now the particular branch of the profession with which this society is occupied is that of the clerks of solicitors and barristers. I should like to say a word for them—the other branches of the profession can say a good deal for themselves. The judges don't talk about themselves, but a good deal is talked about them. They get every credit, and they deserve every credit for the work which they do. The barristers can sing their own praises, and we all recognize, and everyone is ready to recognize, the work of solicitors, and how difficult it would be for the world to get on without the aid of solicitors; but I think it is important that we should remember the work which is done by the clerks. Now I am quite sure that, with regard to the solicitors, they would be the very first to join with me in saying how important, how invaluable, is the assistance which they derive from the skill and intelligence of the clerks who conduct their business. I know that when I was at the bar nothing struck me more than the knowledge, the intelligence, the zeal, the activity, and, at the same time, the honourable and straightforward dealing of those who came into contact with me as the clerks of the solicitors by whom I was retained. What shall I say of the clerks of barristers? I am sure the experience of barristers is the experience of myself. I know that every barrister will agree with me that it would be almost impossible for the bar to perform the work which they do perform if they were not supported by the zeal, fidelity, energy, and intelligence of their clerks; and I can say this, that I have never found in any profession greater intelligence than that which I have met with among clerks of barristers. Now, gentlemen, this is a society which, as I said, professes to take care of the interests of these clerks, and it appears to me absolutely necessary that there should be some organization to protect their interests, and to provide for them. The country provides very handsomely for the judges in the way of pensions—the successful barrister or the successful solicitor can manage very well to provide for himself, and to store up for himself in case evil times should come upon him; but the reality in the case of clerks is this, that living as they must do, merely upon their salary, even giving them credit for a great amount of thrift, it is absolutely impossible that they can provide against the contingency of sickness or of breakdowns from work, unless they have got some kind of organization which will be in the nature of an assurance to them against these casualties. Now, it is this end which is accomplished by work of this society. I am not going to tell you all the details of it. You will find them in the papers which are distributed about the tables; but it appears to me that the society addresses itself exactly to those objects which one would desire to see met by a society of this kind. It provides temporary maintenance for those who are suffering under temporary illness; it provides pensions for those who are permanently incapacitated; it provides lump payments, if I may call them so, at the time of a death in the family, when the payment of a lump sum is required; it provides for payments to those who are suffering from some temporary misfortunes. Now, these appear to me to be exactly the objects which ought to be met by a society of this kind, and the only observation which I will make with regard to what I find in the report is this, that I am somewhat disappointed that the number of members of the society is not greater than it is. I find there are about 800 members of the society. Well, but when I think of the number of solicitors in the country, the number of solicitors' clerks, the number of barristers, and the number of barristers' clerks, and when I think of what it requires to constitute a thoroughly efficient mutual benefit society, it appears to me that 800 is by no means the number we ought to find in this society. Now let us think how this can be remedied. I cannot help thinking that a little compulsion would be desirable—a little mild compulsion. I do not quite see why solicitors should not exert themselves a little more. Why should solicitors not say to those whom they are employing, "We make it a rule that you should belong to the United Law Clerks' Society." I believe that every solicitor in a good position would find not the least difficulty in getting clerks to do his work if he would make that a condition. I commend it seriously to the attention of

solicitors. But now I turn to barristers. I ask the barristers of London, Do they endeavour to make it a condition with their clerks that they should join this society? I strongly recommend them to do so, and I have not the least doubt they would succeed. I recollect very well what was done by the East India Company. It was very much grumbled at at the time, but I believe it was one of the greatest blessings ever given by the Indian Government, both to their civil and military servants, that the members should contribute to a fund for their mutual benefit. I believe this fund gave to both the civil and military services a degree of popularity which they could not otherwise have had, and I believe it would greatly benefit barristers' and solicitors' clerks. This society has, I believe, done a great deal of good and has prevented a great deal of misery and suffering, and I most earnestly recommend it to your favour. I trust it will go on and prosper, and I hope that when it reaches its fiftieth anniversary—as it will do shortly—that it will be able to say for the meeting of that year that it numbers not only 800, but may I say 1,500 members. I believe it is necessary, especially looking to the pensions which the society grants, that its numbers should be increased. It must have reserve funds in order that these pensions may be properly secured. I commend it, therefore, to your notice, and I ask the meeting now to drink to the prosperity and welfare of the United Law Clerks' Society.

Several other toasts having been given the proceedings terminated.

The donations announced amounted to upwards of £600.

Obituary.

MR. CHARLES HENRY PHILLIPS.

Mr. Charles Henry Phillips, solicitor, registrar of the Hull County Court, died at his residence at Cottingham, Yorkshire, on the 27th inst. Mr. Phillips was born in 1796, was admitted a solicitor in 1820, and had practised at Hull for nearly sixty years. He was formerly in partnership with Mr. John Alderson, and was subsequently associated with Mr. Henry Copeman, and still more recently with his son Mr. Arthur Bentley Phillips, who was admitted a solicitor in 1861. Mr. Phillips was a perpetual commissioner for Hull and the East Riding of Yorkshire, and he had a good private business. He was formerly law clerk to the Hull and Selby Railway Company, and clerk to the old Court of Requests at Hull. He had been registrar of the Hull County Court (Circuit No. 16) ever since the passing of the first County Court Act; but three or four years ago, in consequence of his increasing years and the pressure of official business, Dr. Albert Kaye Rolitt was associated with him as joint registrar. Mr. Phillips was also district registrar for Hull under the Judicature Acts.

SIR MUTU COOMARA SWAMY.

Sir Mutu Coomara Swamy, knight, died recently at Colombo, Ceylon, at the age of forty-five. The deceased was a native of Ceylon, where he was born in 1834. He was educated at Que-n'a College, Colombo, and subsequently spent several years in England, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Hilary Term, 1863. He was soon afterwards admitted as an advocate of the High Court at Madras, where he practised for several years. He afterwards returned to Ceylon, and was appointed a member of the Legislative Council of the colony. He took a very active part in colonial politics, and received the honour of knighthood in 1874. The deceased was a distinguished Oriental scholar, and was the author of several works in the Tamil language. He was married to the daughter of the late Mr. Richard Beeby.

A correspondent of the *Western Jurist* refers to a suit against a railroad company in 1868 (33 N. J. 94), in which Vredenburg, J., said: "Another point is, that the damages were too high. The plaintiff lost three of his toes by the accident. The jury thought 2,500 dollars, not too high a price for them, nor am I so satisfied that it was too much that I would feel justified in interfering with the verdict. We all know that almost everything has risen in value very much within the last few years."

Appointments, &c.

Mr. JOHN ARTHUR GIRLING, solicitor, of 64, Chancery-lane, has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. JOHN INDERMAUR (of the firm of Lewis & Indermaur, solicitors, 22, Chancery-lane), has been appointed a Commissioner to administer Oaths in the Supreme Court of Judicature.

Mr. JOHN LAMBERT, C.B., has been created a Civil Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath. Sir J. Lambert was admitted a solicitor in 1836, and practised for several years at Salisbury in partnership with Mr. Charles. He retired from practice about twenty years ago on being appointed a poor law inspector. He was appointed permanent secretary to the Local Government Board in 1872, having been in the previous year created a Civil Companion of the Order of the Bath.

Mr. RALPH ROBERT WHEELER LINGEN, barrister, C.B., has been created a Civil Knight Commander of the Order of the Bath. Sir R. Lingen is the only son of the late Mr. Thomas Lingen, of Birmingham, and was born in 1819. He was educated at Bridgnorth Grammar School, and was formerly scholar of Trinity College, Oxford, where he graduated first class in *litera humaniores* in 1840. He obtained the Ireland Scholarship in 1838, the Hertford Scholarship in 1839, the Chancellor's Prize for a Latin essay in 1843, and the Eldon Law Scholarship in 1846. He was elected a fellow of Balliol College, and was called to the bar at Lincoln's-inn in Easter Term, 1847. He was appointed secretary to the committee of the Privy Council in 1849, and permanent secretary to the Treasury in 1870, in which year he was also created a Civil Companion of the Order of the Bath.

Mr. HENRY WILLIAM HENNIKER RANCE, solicitor (of the firm of Wynne, Baxter, & Rance, of 9, Lawrence Pountney-hill, and of the firm of Rance & Son, of Cambridge and Ely), has been elected Honorary Secretary to the Cambridge-shire Law Society. Mr. Rance is the son of Mr. Henry Rance, solicitor. He is a LL.M. of Trinity Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated in the third class of the Law Tripos in 1865, and he was admitted a solicitor in 1866.

Legislation of the Week.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

MAY 15.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—East London Railway, Eastbourne Local Board.

CATHEDRAL STATUTES. PIER AND HARBOURS CONFIRMATION.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

HABITUAL DRUNKARDS (passed through Committee).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Trefez Valley Railway, Dudley Sewage, London (City) Tithes Commutation, Christ Church, Newgate-street (London) Tithes, Pemberton Local Board, Brighton and Hove Gas.

MAY 16.—BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Severn Bridge and Forest of Dean Central Railway, Sleaford Water, Cranbrook and Paddock Wood Railway, and London, Chatham, and Dover Railway.

MAY 19.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Grantham Borough.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE, &c.).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILL.—Birmingham Corporation Water.

MAY 20.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Cambridge Tramways (No. 1), Metropolitan and Metropolitan District Railway Companies.

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—East London Railway, Rawmarsh Local Board, Bromley Gas.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS CONFIRMATION (ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE, &c.).

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MAY 15.—BILL IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (clauses 30—36).

MAY 16.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

NOXIOUS GASES. LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROVISIONAL ORDERS (ARTIZANS DWELLINGS). MEDICAL ACT (1858) AMENDMENT (Nos. 1, 2, and 3). MEDICAL APPOINTMENTS QUALIFICATION (referred to a select Committee). LICENSING LAWS AMENDMENT.

BILL IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (clauses 37—42).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Vicars' and Smith's Patent, Yarmouth and North Norfolk (Light) Railway.

MAY 19.—BILLS READ A SECOND TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Roper's Estate, Teign Valley Extension.

CUSTOMS AND INLAND REVENUE. GREAT SEAL. CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 3).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Aire and Calder Navigation, Imperial Continental Gas Association, South-Eastern Railway, Warington Corporation.

MAY 20.—BILLS IN COMMITTEE.

ARMY DISCIPLINE AND REGULATION (clauses 43—44). CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 3) (passed through Committee).

BILLS READ A THIRD TIME.

PRIVATE BILLS.—Ikley Gas, Lancashire County Justices, Metropolitan Railway, Rotherham Borough, Swindon, Marlborough, and Andover Railway, Thames and Severn Canal, Vestry of St. Pancras.

MAY 21.—BILL READ A THIRD TIME.

CONSOLIDATED FUND (No. 3).

Court Papers.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON

Date.	COURT OF APPEAL.	MASTER OF THE ROLLS.	V.C. MALINS.
Monday, May..	26 Mr. Koe	Mr. Jackson	Mr. Farrer
Tuesday	27 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
Wednesday	28 Koe	Jackson	Farrer
Thursday	29 Clowes	Cobby	Teesdale
Friday	30 Koe	Jackson	Farrer
	V. C. BACON.	V. C. HALL.	Mr. Justice Fry.
Monday, May .	26 Mr. Latham	Mr. Pemberton	Mr. Merivale
Tuesday	27 Leach	Ward	King
Wednesday	28 Latham	Pemberton	Merivale
Thursday	29 Leach	Ward	King
Friday	30 Latham	Pemberton	Merivale

The Whitsun Vacation will commence on Saturday, the 31st day of May, and terminate on Tuesday, the 3rd day of June, 1879, both days inclusive.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

LONDON.

EASTER SITTING, 1879.

This list contains all actions entered in Queen's Bench, Common Pleas, and Exchequer Divisions, in which notice of trial has been given; and also all actions in the Chancery Division, in which notice has been given of trial before a judge and jury, up to and including 23rd of April, 1879.

LIST OF ACTIONS FOR TRIAL.

CP 1	The Chartered Mercantile Bank of India, London and China (Waltons, B and W) v The Netherlands India Steam Navigation Co, lmd (Lovell and Co), commission SJ
CP 2	Frowin and ors (Stephen Scott) v Sonnenthal (Ashurst, M and Co), stayed SJ
QB 3	Moffatt and ors (Ingledew, I and G) v Williams (Plews, I and M), commission
CP 4	Allen (Roberts and B) v Wakefield (Waltons, B and W), commission, SJ
CP 5	Lopez (H Montagu) v Rae (G R Innes and Son) SJ
CP 6	Breffit (A Jones, T and G) v Williams (Norris, A and C), stayed
Ex 7	Hanbury (Mercer and Mercer) v Grant and Clark and Punchard (Ashurst, M and Co, Blunt, T and L) SJ, and 77 other actions against the same defendants, postponed
Ex 85	James Watt and Co (G Webb) v Mersey Steel and Iron Co, lmd (Norris, A and C) SJ

Ex 86	Ostrom and Fischer (H J Coburn) v Heints (Nash and F), stayed
CP 87	Rathbone and ors (Freshfields and W) v Caldwell (J B Towse), commission SJ
QB 88	Leese (Jno Frost) v Household (Field, B and Co), stayed SJ
Ex 90	Hogendijk (J R Bailey) v Vander Zee (Simpson and C), commission SJ
Ex 90	Masaru and ors (Murray, Hutchins and Co) v Hobley (Hollams, Son and C), commission SJ
CP 91	Keay and anr (Pritchard and Sons) v Young and ors (Clarkes, R and C; J Scott; Burton, Y and Co; Belfrage and M), commission SJ
CP 92	Amazon Tug and Lighterage Co, lmd (Ashurst, M and Co) v Earle's Shipbuilding and Engineering Co, lmd (Chester, U and Co), commission SJ
QB 93	Pendersen (Johnsons, U, B and A) v Dobell and Co (Field, R and Co), commission SJ
QB 94	Dreyfus, Freres and Cie (Shibbald, G and Co) v Watts, Milburn and Co (Torr and Co), commission SJ
CP 95	Gardiner (Waltons, B and W) v Warns (F Bradley) SJ
CP 96	Lawson (Tucker, B and Co) v Yeomans (Collette and C)
CP 97	Walker (S H Behrend) v Hough (Bloxam and E), without jury, stayed
CP 98	Jasmins (Lowless and Co) v Hyde (Hollams, Son and C), commission SJ
QB 99	Vanderzee and Co (Simpson and C) v Campbell, Robertson and Co (J R Chidley) SJ
QB 100	Weigel (W Beck) v Anderson and ors (Hollams, Son and C), postponed
Ex 101	Young (Wilkins, B and F) v The Sonora Co and ors (Elmslie and Co; Mosley and S) SJ
CP 102	A Tesdorpf and Co (Waltons, B and W) v Gates (T Cooper and Co), stayed SJ
Ex 103	Bilbrough (Hacon and T) v Henderson (Dawes and Sons), commission SJ
QB 104	Hallet and Wife (Brooks, Jenkins and Co) v Gates (T Cooper and Co) SJ
CP 105	Reynolds (J P Garrod) v Cooper (Fisher and Co), postponed
QB 106	Price (D Birt) v The London and County Banking Co (Stephens and H) SJ
CP 107	Bevington, Foster and Co (Waltons, B and W) v Rawlins (Hollams, Son & Co), commission SJ
CP 108	Strauss and Co (P W Mount) v Continental Daily Parcels Express (Dalton and J), commission
Ex 109	Silberberg (in Person) v Coratt (J Hill), before Sir H Hawkins, part heard
QB 110	Morgan (Ingledew, I and G) v Finlay (Hollams, Son and C), commission
CP 111	Armstrong and ors (Lawrance, P and B) v Callender (Drake and Son) SJ
QB 112	New South Wales Marine Assurance Co (Hollams, Son and C) v Reade (Waltons, B and W), commission SJ
QB 113	Alexander (J C Campbell) v McMaster (Venning, Rand J), stayed
QB 114	Ochse and Co (Hollams, Son and C) v Aspinwall and Co (Druce, Son and J), commission SJ
CP 115	Silva and anr (W A Crump and Son) v Larkins and anr (Lowless and Co), commission
Ex 116	Brown (T H E Ford) v Groom (Pownall, Son, C and K), Groom v Brown, consolidated, postponed
QB 117	Waterhouse (Lawford and Co) v London & S W Ry Co (M H Hall) SJ
CP 118	Coates (Stevens and H) v Same (Same) SJ
CP 119	Leary and Co (Markby, S and Co) v Wiarda (G J Jennings commission
Ex 120	De Bierge and Co, lmd (Wilkins, B and F) v Ward and ors (Pacock and G; Pritchard and Son; J M Chamberlain) stayed SJ
QB 121	The Central African Trading Co, lmd (Flux and Co) v Walsh Bros (Milne, R and M), commission
QB 122	Falkenburg and Hesse (Hollams, Son and C) v Kumpers and Co (W A Crump and Son), commission SJ
Ex 123	Perry (Lewis, M and L) v Gould and anr (W F Morris)
QB 124	Standard Lubricating Oils Co, lmd (H Kimber and Co) Smith (Champion and Co), commission
CP 125	Beeson (Farnfields) v Culliford and ors (Hollams, Son and C), commission
QB 126	Dale and Spring (Hollams, Son and C) v Wakefield (Waltons, B and W), commission SJ
CP 127	Turnbull, Stewart and Co (Waltons, B and W) v De Putron (Stocken and Co), commission SJ
QB 128	Dickinson (Haywards, K and S) v Stanbridge (Clapham & F), stayed
CP 129	Finch (H Montagu) v Dixon (Argies and H), commission SJ
Ex 130	Hough and Co (Lyne and H) v Manzanos and Co (Ingledew, I and G) SJ
QB 131	Stiebel Bros (Hollams, Son and C) v Cumming (Waltons, B and W), stayed SJ
QB 132	Same (Same) v Alliance Marine Insurance Co (Same), stayed SJ
QB 133	Same (Same) v Uzielli (Same), stayed SJ
Ex 134	Hackett (Scard and Son) v Gaby (Robert Wood), stayed
QB 135	Schulte and Schemann (Hollams, Son and C) v Hopkins, Gilkes and Co (Van Sandau and C), stayed SJ
CP 136	Berla, Cotrim and Co (Norton, R and Co) v E Pellas & Co (Lowless and Co), commission SJ
QB 137	Stiebel Bros (Hollams, Son and C) v Pitman (Waltons, B and W), stayed SJ
QB 138	J Chabot & Co (Same) v Bischoff (Same), commission SJ
QB 139	Eklot (Stokes, S and S) v Greenhow and Co (Billinghurst and W), stayed SJ
Ex 140	Boyd and Co (Rocks & Co) v Day (G Lucas)
Ex 141	Candy and Co (Same) v Same (Same)
Ex 142	Same (Same) v Same (Same)

(To be continued.)

SALES OF THE ENSUING WEEK.

May 27.—Messrs. HARVEY & DAVIDS, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold properties (see advertisement, April 26, p. 521).
 May 29.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TAWSON, & FARMER, at the Mart, at 2 p.m., freehold ground-rents (see advertisement, May 17, p. 6).
 May 29.—Messrs. HARRY FOSTER & Co., at the Mart, at 1 p.m., leasehold properties (see advertisement, this week, p. 3).

PUBLIC COMPANIES.

May 22, 1879.

GOVERNMENT FUNDS.

3 per Cent. Consols, 98½
 Ditto for Account, June 3, 98½
 Do. 3 per Cent. Reduced, 97
 New 3 per Cent., 97
 Do. 3½ per Cent., Jan. '94
 Do. 2½ per Cent., Jan. '94
 Annuities, Jan. '80
 Annuities, April, '85, 9½
 Do. (Red Sea T.) Aug. 1868
 Ex Bills, £1000, 2½ per Ct. 22 pm.
 Ditto, £500, Do. 22 pm.
 Ditto, £100 & £500, 22 pm.
 Bank of England Stock, 262
 Ditto for Account.

INDIAN GOVERNMENT SECURITIES.

Ind. Stk., 5 per Cent. July, '80, 103½
 Ditto for Account, —
 Ditto 4 per Cent., Oct. '85, 101½
 Ditto, ditto, Certificates —
 Ditto Encased Ppr., 1 per Cent.
 Ind. Inf. Pr., 5 per Ct., Jan. '73
 Inf. Pr. 5½ per Cent., May, 81
 Ditto Debentures, 4 per Cent,
 April, '64
 Do. Do. 5 per Cent., Aug. '73
 Do. Bonds, 4 per Cent. £1000
 Ditto, ditto, under £1000

RAILWAY STOCK.

Railways.	Paid.	Closing Price.
Stock Bristol and Exeter	100	—
Stock Caledonian	100	102½
Stock Glasgow and South-Western	100	84
Stock Great Eastern Ordinary Stock	100	59½
Stock Great Northern	100	121
Stock Do., A Stock	100	121
Stock Great Southern and Western of Ireland	100	119
Stock Great Western—Original	100	98½
Stock Lancashire and Yorkshire	100	124
Stock London, Brighton, and South Coast	100	130
Stock London, Chatham, and Dover	100	25½
Stock London and North-Western	100	143½
Stock London and South Western	100	134½
Stock Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincoln	100	78
Stock Metropolitan	100	117½
Stock Do., District	100	64½
Stock Midland	100	127½
Stock North British	100	81½
Stock North Eastern	100	125½
Stock North London	100	162½
Stock North Staffordshire	100	53
Stock South Devon	100	—
Stock South-Eastern	100	127

* A receives no dividend until 6 per cent. has been paid to B.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

BAINES.—May 12, at No. 1, Park villas, St. Giles, Oxford, the wife of Henry Baines, solicitor, of a son.
 DUNCAN.—May 18, at 31, Connaught-square, Hyde-park, the wife of C. A. Duncan, barrister-at-law, of a daughter.
 DUNCAN.—May 14, at St. Margaret's, Twickenham, the wife of George James Duncan, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, of a son.
 JENKINS.—May 17, the wife of William Jenkins, of 13, Cranley-place, Onslow-square, S.W., barrister-at-law, of a son.
 KITE.—May 17, at Haines Hill, Taunton, the wife of George H. Kite, solicitor, of a daughter.
 MOYLAN.—March 22, at Glenelg, Tobago, W.L., the wife of the Hon. Edward K. Moylan, Attorney-General of Tobago, of a son.
 WOOD.—May 15, at 5, Park-lane, Stoke Newington, N., the wife of William Wood, solicitor, of a son.

MARRIAGE.

PORTER-HOUSTON.—May 17, at Rawdon, near Leeds, James Biggs Porter, of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, to Rosina Louisa, daughter of the late Henry Houston, of The Elms, Louisa.

DEATHS.

HUDSON.—May 12, at his residence, Little Burgh, Banstead, Surrey, after a few days' illness, George Frederick Hudson, senior partner in the firm of G. F. Hudson, Matthews, & Co., of 23, Bucklersbury, London, aged 79.—The last of his "Goldsmith" line.

PHILLIPS.—May 17, at Cottingham, East Yorks, Charles Henry Phillips, solicitor, registrar of the county court at Hull, aged 82.

SEWELL.—May 14, at 4, Salisbury-villas, Station-road, Cambridge, Henry Sewell, formerly Attorney-General of New Zealand, aged 71.

LONDON GAZETTES.

Professional Partnerships Dissolved.

TUESDAY, May 20, 1879.

King, Joseph Edmund Sheppard, and Edward Negus Wood, North bldgs Finsbury circus, Solicitors. May 13

Winding up of Joint Stock Companies.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

FRIDAY, May 16, 1879.

Bowing's Patent Filter Press Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 7, directed to be heard before V.O. Hall on May 23. Brighton and Co, Bishopsgate at Without, solicitors for the petitioners

Hempstead and Company, Phoenix Iron and Cramp Works, Grantham, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 14, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 24. Aldridge and Co, Bedford row, agents for Towle and Co, Nottingham, solicitors for the petitioners
 Hopkins, Gilkes, and Co, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 13, directed to be heard before M.R. on May 24. Jarvis, Chancery lane, agents for Hutchinson and Lucas, Darlington, solicitors for the petitioners

Hopkins, Gilkes, and Co, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 13, directed to be heard before M.R. on May 24. Jarvis, Chancery lane, agent for Hutchinson and Lucas, Darlington, solicitors for the petitioners

Phoenix Chemical Works, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 12, directed to be heard before the M.R. on May 24. Best and Co, Essex st, Strand, solicitors for the petitioner

Servian Copper and Iron Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated May 9, it was ordered that the company be wound up. Andrew, Clement's lane, solicitor for the petitioners

Skerne Iron Works Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 13, directed to be heard before M.R. on May 24. Jarvis, Chancery lane, agents for Hutchinson and Lucas, Darlington, solicitors for the petitioners

Swedish Central Railway Company, Limited.—By an order made by V.C. Hall, dated May 8, it was ordered that the voluntary winding up of the company be continued. Ashurst and Co, Old Jewry, solicitors for the petitioners

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

Moulden Water Paper Mills, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 14, directed to be heard before V.C. Little on May 26 at 10.30 at 6 Stone buildings, Lincoln's inn. Richardson and Son, Manchester, solicitors for the petitioners

TUESDAY, May 20, 1879.

Anglo-American Leather Cloth Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 16, directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on May 30. Bailey, Tokenhouse yard, solicitor for the petitioner

Avonside Engine Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 19, directed to be heard before M.R. on June 14. Clarke and Co, Lincoln's inn fields, agents for Fussell and Co, Bristol, solicitors for the petitioners

By an order made by the M.R., dated May 10, it was ordered that the Englebourne Slate Quarries, Limited, be wound up. Roberts, Coleman st, solicitor for the petitioners

General Works Company, Limited.—Creditors are required, on or before June 18 to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts and claims to Frederick William Snell, George st, Mansion House. Friday, June 27 at 12, is appointed for hearing and adjudicating upon the debts and claims

Holyhead Ship Building and Tating Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up, presented May 12, is directed to be heard before V.C. Hall on May 30. Brand-ett and Co, King's Bench walk, Temple, agents for Dew, Llangefni, solicitor for the petitioner
 Sasso Forte Collieries Company, Limited.—Creditors are required on or before June 30, to send their names and addresses and the particulars of their debts or claims to Charles Fitch Kemp, Walbrook. Tillsard and Co, Old Jewry, solicitors for the liquidator

COUNTY PALATINE OF LANCASTER.

TUESDAY, May 20, 1879.

Chorley Co-operative Spinning and Manufacturing Company, Limited.—Petition Apr 3. Court ordered that the above company be wound up
 Daisyfield Cotton Spinning and Manufacturing Company, Limited.—The V.C. has fixed May 28 at 11 at 13, Winkley st, Preston, as the time and place for the appointment of an official liquidator

STANNARIES OF CORNWALL.

TUESDAY, May 20, 1879.

Saint Austell China Clay Company, Limited.—Petition for winding up presented May 13, directed to be heard before the Vice-Warden at Prince's Hall, Truro, on May 28 at 11. Affidavits intended to be used at the hearing in opposition to the petition must be filed at the Registrar's Office, Truro, on or before May 26, and notice thereof must at the same time be given to the petitioner, his solicitor, or his agent. Paul, Truro, agent for Hewlett, Essex st, Strand, solicitor for the petitioner

Friendly Societies Dissolved.

FRIDAY, May 16, 1879.

Benefit Society of Engineers, Stokers, &c, General Steam Navigation Company, Deptford, Kent. May 12

Wolverton and Stantonbury Friendly Sick Society, Wolverton, Buckingham. May 13

German Waiters' Friendly Society, King st. Golden square. May 14
Guardian Benefit Society, Queen's Arms, Queen st. May 15.

Creditors under Estates in Chancery.

Last Day of Proof.

FRIDAY, May 16, 1879.

Dosworth, William, Twycross, Leicester. Nurseryman. July 1.
Orchard v Dosworth. V C Hall. Cheshire, Ashby-de-la-Zouch
Downing, Jonathan, Gravesend, Gent. June 16. Downing v Downing.
M R. Barries, Coleman st, London
Hayes, Thomas, Boughton, Kent, Farmer. June 16. Hayes v Hayes.
V C Hall. Howlett, Maidstone
Pearson, Ann, Manchester. June 6. Grundy v Grundy, M R. Grundy, Bury
Rennick, Francis, Norfolk terrace, Bayswater. June 16. Rennick v Beatty, Fry, J. Carpenter, Elm ct, Temple, London
Richardson, Charles Stansfield, Bayford, Herts, Farmer. June 21.
Richardson v Gordon, V C Hall. Norris, Bedford row, London
Smith, Sadler, Holywell row, Carman, June 10. Munford v Smith, M R. Jenkinson, Eastcheap

TUESDAY, May 20, 1879.

Lardner, Jane Sophia, Teignmouth, Devon. June 25. Tozer v Dyott, V.C. Hall. Pearson and Whidborne, Dawlish
Lewin, Frederick Mortimer, Besley, Esq. June 24. Booker v Abbott, V.C. Hall. Abbott and Co, New inn, Strand
Mears, Frederick Charles, Leadenhall st, Colonial Agent. June 19. Fenton v Mears, M.R. Storton, Holbeach
Pitman, Robert, Highgate hill, M.D. June 20. Pitman v Pitman, V.C. Hall. Scoles, Bedford row
Powell, Richard, Warley Wigorn, Worcester, Farmer. June 21. Powell v Brigg, V.C. Hall. Wright, Oldbury
Shotlander, Moses, Duke st, Aldgate, Merchant. June 17. Davison v Woolf, M.R. Harte, Moorgate st
Williams, John, Pen-y-bryn, Wrexham, Gent. June 17. Williams v Evans, M.L. James, Wrexham

Creditors under 23 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

Last Day of Claim.

FRIDAY, May 9, 1879.

Andrews, Henry, Bound's Green rd, Wood Green, Gent. June 10.
Croft, Union ct, Old Broad st
Baichin, Rev Henry James, Old Charlton, Kent, Clerk. June 30.
Jones and Grove, Queen st, Chesham
Barwell, Edward, East Dereham, Norfolk, Merchant. June 19.
Wright and Barton, East Dereham
Bateson, Henry, St. George's rd, Southwark, Doctor in Medicine.
June 16. Miller and Wiggins, Copthall-court, Throgmorton-st
Bowie, Robert, Boston, Lincoln, Gent. May 16. Bassitt, Wainfleet
Brading, George, Ryde, Isle of Wight, Butcher. June 1. Urry, Ryde
Child, William Dimdale, Finsbury place, South, India Merchant.
Aug 1. Frideaux and Son, Goldsmith's Hall, Foster lane
Clinton, Henry Peilham Alexander Peilham, the Most Noble Duke of Newcastle, Clumber, Nottingham. June 10. Lake and Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn
Darbishire, Vernon, Glancey Cood, Carnarvon, Esq. June 30. Cunliffe and Co, Chancery lane, London
Ellis, Elizabeth, Bath. June 14. Horsley, Staple-inn, London
Farmer, William Charles Love, Brayfield, Buckingham. Aug 1. Domville and Co, New sq, Lincoln's inn
Farrington, William, Gt Dover st, Southwark, Flour Factor. June 16.
Miller and Wiggin, Copthall ct, Throgmorton st
Fletcher, Hannah Charlotte, Princess terrace, South Hampstead.
June 24. Gray, Edgware rd
Frail, John, Shrewsbury, Salop, Gent. June 14. Clarke and Sons, Shrewsbury
Gibbs, William, Stratford-on-Avon, Warwick, Farmer. June 21.
Slatter and Co, Stratford-on-Avon
Hughan, Thomas, Haikin st West, Esq. June 20. Freshfields and Williams, Bank bldgs
Jones, Letitia, Pulvertoch, Salop. June 14. Craig, Shrewsbury
Jones, William, Penybont, Merioneth, Hotel Keeper. June 1.
Longueville and Co, Oswestry
Kitching, William, Ramsgate, Kent, Gent. June 24. Hilder, Jermyn st, St James's
Knight, Edwin, Wellingborough, Northampton, Gent. Aug 15.
Burnham and Henry, Wellingborough
Leatham, John, Kingston-upon-Hull, Gent. June 30. Rallitt and Son, Hull
Morgan, Edward, Tunbridge Wells, Kent, Esq. June 30. Cummins and Sons, Chancery lane
Moses, Joseph, Leadenhall st, Bristle Merchant. June 19. Emanuel and Simmonds, Finsbury circus
Nicoll, Thomas, Marshall st, Soho, Clothworker. June 30. Lindsay and Co, Basinghall st
Orme, Eliza, Derby. May 31. Flint, Derby
Phillips, John, Hailton, York, Farmer. June 7. Harland, Leeds
Randall, Ellen, Arundel, Sussex. July 1. Daily, Arundel
Remfrey, William, Queen's gardens, Hyde Park, Esq. July 10. Lee and Pemberton, Lincoln's inn fields
Ridley, Ann, Norton, Durham. June 24. Crosby and Archer, Stockton-on-Tees
Roberts, Maryn John, Bath, Esq. July 3. Inman and Inman, Bath
Robinson, Jethro Thomas, Bloomsbury sq, Middlesex, Architect. June 30. Carhill, Hull
Rogers, William, Blyton, Lincoln, Farmer. May 26. Burton and Son, Gainsborough
Sanderson, Sarah, Sheffield. July 1. Clegg and Sons, Sheffield
Scarrott, Mary Elizabeth, New North st, Finsbury. July 7. Blackford and Co, College hill, Cannon st
Sibun, Alfred, Lewisham, Kent, Gent. July 1. Farnfield, Queen Victoria st, London

Sessions, John, St Marks, Cheltenham, Builder. July 5. Mallory, Cheltenham
Shaw, Robert Bonnell, Leicester, Plasterer. June 24. Stevenson, Leicester
Simpson, John, Cray's Hill, Essex, Gent. May 30. Woodard, Chelmsford
Smallpage, Nathan, Colne, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturer. July 1. Carr, Colne
Stephens, Joseph Jost, Bayham st, Camden Town, Gas Collector. May 21. Paine and Co, Gresham House
Tribe, Mary, Amhurst place, Sussex. June 14. Holmes, Arundel
Vaughan, Joseph, Chesham, Manchester, Dyer. June 9. Payne and Galloway, Manchester
Ward, Henry, Drayton, Leicester, Farmer. June 3. Freer and Co, Leicester
Ward Robert Burgess, Drayton, Leicester, Grazier. June 3. Freer and Co, Leicester
Wembergue, Francois Eugene, Gloucester, Esq. June 11. Ticehurst and Pons, Cheltenham
Wormalley, Robert Huntingdon, Carpenter. June 2. Jennings and Ashby, Morris, Staines, Brewer. June 24. Fisher and Fisher, Leadenhall st
Young, James Simpson, Grange-over-Sands, Lancaster, Esq. June 12. Coburn and Young, Leadenhall st

TUESDAY, May 13, 1879.

Ainslie, Henry Francis, Piccadilly, Esq. June 23. Farrer and Co, Lincoln's inn fields
Alderson, George, Wrangthorne, Leeds. June 13. Chambers, Wrangthorne, Woodhouse
Arney, Charles Augustus, Senior United Service Club, a retired Colonel in HM's Army. July 1. Winterbotham and Co, Cheltenham
Ashby, Morris, Staines, Brewer. June 24. Fisher and Fisher, Leadenhall st
Baddeley, Ann, Regent st, Marylebone. July 2. Young and Co, St. Mildred's ct
Baily, Edwin, Cirencester, Bookseller. Aug 1. Sewell and Co, Cirencester
Ball, Joseph, Brownhills, Stafford, Engineer. June 1. Willcock, Wolverhampton
Besley, William Rutter, Sidbury, Devon, Esq. July 1. Slee and Co, Potter's fields, Southwark
Bernard, Joseph, Southampton, Esq. June 24. Green and Moberly, Southampton
Bilton, William, Southsea, Bootmaker. June 24. Edgcombe and Co, Portsmouth
Bird, John, Carlton Colville, Suffolk, Farmer. June 14. Nicholson, Lowestoft
Bird, William, Carlton Colville, Suffolk, Yeoman. June 14. Nicholson, Lowestoft
Blakemore, John, Edgmond, Salop, Gent. June 1. Heane, Newport
Blakemore, Mary, Edgmond, Salop. June 1. Heane, Newport
Blakey, William, Bunslingthorpe, near Leeds, Wheelwright. June 30. Eddison, Leeds
Bowyer, Henry, Old Corn Exchange, Corn Factor. June 30. Slack, Guilford st, Russell sq
Bulley, Caroline Mary, Park villas, Teddington. June 19. Coote, Curator st, Chancery lane
Cannon, Mary, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset. June 1. Starpools and Son, Old Broad st, London
Dewar, Ebenezer, Gordon st, Gordon sq, Esq. July 7. Hare and Fell, Surrey st, Strand
Dickinson, Nathaniel, Nottingham park, Nottingham, Pawnbroker. July 1. Wells and Hind, Nottingham
Disturnal, Richard, Wednesbury, Stafford, Coach Manufacturer. June 24. Slater and Marshall, Butcrot
Dove, Peter Robinson, Bishopwearmouth, Durham, Shipowner. June 1. Siceb, Sunderland
Dunford, Anthony William, Stoke Newington, Devon, Lieut-Colonel Royal Engineers. June 21. Tyrrell & Co, Albany court yard, Piccadilly
Fordham, Priscilla Ebenezer, Dover. June 24. Carnell and Sons, Sevenoaks
Foxton, Rev George Lardner, Kempsey, Clerk. July 1. Gabriel, Lincoln's inn fields
Herbert, Thomas, Nottingham park, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer. July 1. Wells and Hind, Nottingham
Huckerby, William, Biogham, Nottingham, Gent. June 4. Bassitt, Wainfleet
Jenkins, Emma, Queenborough, Kent, Licensed Victualler. May 21. Hayward and Smith, High st, Rochester
James, Elizabeth, Derby. June 27. Sale and Mills, Derby
Kidd, Edward, Birmingham, Electro Plater. July 14. Taylor, Birmingham
Manning, Frederick, Laxar st, Coldharbour lane, Clerk. June 12. Stenry, Holland grove, North Brixton
Miller, James, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Surgeon. July 1. Mather and Co, Newcastle-on-Tyne
Parkyn, Eliza Margery Mary, Croydon, Surrey. June 24. Boriace and Co, Penzance
Peirce, Priscilla, Dover. June 24. Carnell and Sons, Sevenoaks
Roberts, William Henry Geoffrey, Half Moon st, Piccadilly, Esq. June 14. Reyroux and Co, Cannon st
Ryall, Elizabeth, Cheltenham. July 1. Winterbotham and Co, Cheltenham
Speller, James Lazarus, Finsbury st, Finsbury, Wholesale Stationer. July 15. Harcourt and Macarthur, Moorgate st
Taylor, George Washington, Manchester, Gent. June 20. Sale and Co, Manchester
Thick, Charles, Yate, Gloucester, Solicitor. June 30. Harley, Bristol
Toller, Thomas, Gray's inn, Esq. June 12. Toller and Sons, Knight Rider st, Doctors' Commons
Wakeling, Mary, Maddox st, Regent st. June 24. Routh and Co, Southampton st, Bloomsbury
Warren, George, King David lane, Shadwell, Carpenter. July 10. Sweptone, Lime st
Whitfield, Mary, Gower st. July 1. Wragg and Edwards, Great St. Helens, London

Williams, Catharine, Aberschyan, Monmouth, June 1. Boodle, New Swindon
 Wills, George, Naborborough, Leicester, Gent. July 5. Miles and Co, Leicester
 Winter, Rev Alfred Litt, Oare Vicarage, nr Faversham. June 14.
 Lowe, Tanfield ct, Temple
 Wise, R-becca, East Malling, Kent. June 25. Norton and Son, Town Malling
 Wooltorton, John, Oulton-next-Lewestoft, Gent. June 14. Nicholson, Lowestoft
 Yetton, Thomas, Gt Yarmouth, Gent. June 27. Beard and Sons, Basinghall st, London

Bankrupts.

FRIDAY, May 16, 1879.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar. To Surrender in London.

Denton, Robert Thomas, Moor lane, Coffee Roaster. Pet May 13.
 Murray, May 30 at 12
 Hounsell, George Collins, St Mary Axe, Rope Manufacturer. Pet May 14. Brougham. May 27 at 11
 Ogden, John, Cannon st, Mantle Manufacturer. Pet May 8. Hazlitt. May 28 at 11

To Surrender in the Country.

Child, Charles William, Berwick-upon-Tweed, Victualler. Pet May 12.
 Daggett, Newcastle, May 29 at 11
 Corden, Henry, Chest-rtion, Stafford, Ironfounder. Pet May 13. Tennant.
 Hanley, May 28 at 11
 Foss, William, Beart, Eaton, Berks, Farmer. Pet May 12. Townsend. Swindon, June 3 at 8
 Johnson, John Wallbank, Hebbeln, York, Farmer. Pet May 13.
 Robinson, Bradford, May 30 at 9
 Jones, William, Conway, Carnarvon, Printer. Pet May 12. Jones. Bangor, May 27 at 3.30
 Jordan, Thomas James, Maidenhead, Auctioneer. Pet May 12. Darvill. Windsor, May 31 at 11
 Luddy, Charles Broughton, New Charlton, Kent, cut of business. Pet May 9. Pitt-Taylor, Greenwich, June 6 at 1
 Manley, George H., Birmingham, Auctioneer. Pet May 13. Parry. Birmingham, May 27 at 2
 Nightingale, Edward Smith, Blackburn, Ironmonger. Pet May 13.
 Bolton, Blackburn, May 29 at 11
 Preston, John, Edgmond, Salop, Farmer. Pet May 12. Spilsbury. Stafford, June 5 at 11.30
 Statham, George William, Leicester, Leather Merchant. Pet May 13.
 Ingram, Leicester, May 30 at 11
 Taylor, M-rcha, Daniel Taylor, and Thomas Taylor, Road, Somerset, Cloth Manufacturers. Pet May 14. Messiter. Frome, May 30 at 1
 Upton, Samuel, Henry Hanson, Benjamin Farnell, Edwin Farnell, and Jesse Farnell, Cleckton, York, Cobblers. Pet May 13. Robinson. Bradford, May 27 at 9

TUESDAY, May 20, 1879.

Under the Bankruptcy Act, 1869.

Creditors must forward their proofs of debts to the Registrar.

To Surrender in the Country.

Ayling, Charles, Brighton, Dealer in Sewing Machines. Pet May 14.
 Jones, Brighton, June 4 at 11
 Chamen, Richard, Tewkesbury, Churminster, Dorset, Yeoman. Pet May 15. Symonds, Dorchester, June 3 at 11
 Cox, Stephen Fitchew, Pitt Hugh Cox, and George Chapman, Leeds, Leather Factors. Pet May 14. Cauthery, Leeds, June 4 at 11
 McCarthy, Thomas Irvn, Southport, Lancashire, Agent. Pet May 17.
 Bellringer, Liverpool, June 9 at 12
 Mills, John Dadds, Chorlton-upon-Medlock, nr Manchester, Boot Dealer. Pet May 16. Lister, Manchester, June 9 at 11
 Payne, Thomas, Warwick, Draper. Pet May 17. Campbell, Warwick, May 31 at 1
 Roberts, William, Molland, Devon, Labourer. Pet May 14. Benckraft. Barnstaple, June 3 at 11
 Timewell, Stephen Wreford, Kingsbridge, Devon, Corn Merchant. Pet May 15. Edmonds. East Stonehouse, June 4 at 12

BANKRUPTCIES ANNULLED.

TUESDAY, May 20, 1879.

Jennens, Thomas Holbeck, St. Ann's Villa, Notting hill. May 15
 Melville, George Clough, Manchester, Auctioneer. Mar 5
 Mortimore, William Henry, Maidenhead Thicket, Berks, Farmer. May 15

Liquidations by Arrangement.

FIRST MEETINGS OF CREDITORS.

FRIDAY, May 16, 1879.

Alberton, Fetiaphar, Boundary rd, St John's Wood, Wine Dealer. June 9 at 10.15 at offices of Dyde and Stead, Chancery lane. Wolseley, Titchborne st, Edgware rd
 Andrews, Arliss, Mus um ct, Bloomsbury, Printer. May 27 at 11 at offices of Hunt and Co, Charlotte st, Bedford sq
 Arnold, Samuel, Istock, Leicester, Boot and Shoe Maker. May 30 at 3 at offices of Wright and Hinks, Belvoir st, Leicester
 Arthur, William Haddon, Atherstone, Warwick, Builder. May 30 at 3 at offices of Nevill and Atkins, Colehill, Tamworth
 Asley, James, Manchester, Glass Merchant. June 12 at 2 at offices of Hideal, Brzenegre st, Manchester
 Atkins, William, Attercliffe, Sheffield, Steel Manufacturer. May 26 at 2 at offices of Bremhead and Co, Bank chambers, George st, Sheffield
 Auton, Arthur Daniel, Walsall, Stafford, Accountant. May 30 at 3 at offices of Loxton, the Bridge, Walsall
 Barker, David, Rochdale, Lancaster, Innkeeper. May 29 at 3 at the White Swan Hotel, Rochdale. Roberts, Rochdale
 Baxter, Jesse, and Abraham Baxter, Saddleworth, York, Felt Hat Manufacturers. May 29 at 11 at offices of Frupp, Clegg st, Oldham
 Bell, Edward, Cloughton, Birkenhead, Butcher. May 28 at 2 at offices of Thompson and Simm, Hamilton sq, Birkenhead. Francis, Birkenhead
 Bell, Henry, Birmingham, Nail Manufacturer. June 4 at 11 at offices of Beale and Co, Waterloo st, Birmingham

Bellamy, Richard, Lye, Worcester, Pipe Manufacturer. May 26 at 11 at offices of Price, High st, Stourbridge
 Bevan, Edward, Birkenhead, Watch Manufacturer. June 4 at 2 at the Great Western Hotel, Birmingham. Beakley, Birkenhead
 Blenzberg, Wilhelm, Greenfield, Commercial rd East, Provision Merchant. May 28 at 12 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue. Hicks, Commercial rd
 Boettcher, Cloth Alexander Adolph, Houndditch, Toy Merchant. May 28 at 3 at offices of Cannon, King st, Cheshide
 Bradbury, Charles Henry, Croydon, Surrey, Baker. May 29 at 2 at 11, Ironmonger lane, Cheap-side. Pullen, Basinghall st
 Bradbury, Thomas, Willenhall, Stafford, Locksmith. May 30 at 11 at offices of Baker, Walsall st, Willenhall
 Brearey, James, Crackedge, York, Broker. May 28 at 3 at offices of Stapleton, Union st, Dewsbury
 Bright, Thomas, Chard, Somerset, Innkeeper. May 26 at 1 at Chard. Reed and Cook, Taunton
 Brooker, William, Frant, Sussex, Farmer. May 27 at 3 at the Camden Hotel, Tunbridge Wells. Stone and Simpson, Tunbridge Wells
 Brown, Alexander, Curzon, jun, Leyton, Essex, Grocer. June 4 at 3 at offices of Harcourt and Macarthur, Moorgate st
 Chadwick, Edmund, and William Crowther, Burnley, Lancaster, Cotton Manufacturers. May 30 at 3 at the Woolack Hotel, Strangeways, Manchester. Sutcliffe, Burnley
 Chenny, David, Knerdale Bridge, Cumberland, Grocer. May 30 at 12 at offices of Paitson, Irish st, Whitehaven
 Clarke, Thomas, Sheffield, Provision Dealer. June 6 at 3 at offices of Binns, Fig Tree lane, Sheffield
 Conroy, James Crispin, Southampton, Ironmonger. May 26 at 2.30 at offices of Foreman and Co, Gresham st, London. Watts, Southampton
 Cooper, Henry Clifton, Upper St Martin's lane, Auctioneer. May 26 at 2 at offices of Kitch, Argyll pl, Marlborough st
 Crosby, Richard Summerby, Derby, Chemist. May 29 at 3 at offices of Briggs, Amen alley, Derby
 Davidson, Sydney, Cheddleton, Stafford, Common Brewer. June 11 at 2 at offices of Hamehaw, Albion house, Hanley
 DeLacey, John, Wolverhampton, Picture Frame Manufacturer. May 30 at 11 at offices of Rhodes, Queen st, Wolverhampton
 Dickens, William, sen, Davenry, Boot and Shoe Manufacturer. May 30 at 2 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Cresswell, Davenry
 Dodson, George, Salford, Lancaster, Clothier. June 4 at 3 at offices of Cobbett and Co, Brown st, Manchester
 Dolan, James, Goswell rd, Ironmonger. May 30 at 2 at offices of Kelly, Molyneux chambers, Goswell rd
 Duckworth, George, Leeds, Paper Dealer. May 28 at 3 at offices of Pullan, Bond st, Leeds
 Edowdes, John, Oxtou, Chester, out of business. May 28 at 3 at offices of Gibson and Co, South John st, Liverpool. Collins and Co, Liverpool
 Elgie Charles, Stockton-on-Tees, Hairdresser. May 27 at 3 at offices of Hinton and Bolover, Stockton-on-Tees
 Elliott, John, Gallowgate, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Brewer. May 27 at 2 at offices of Joel, Newgate st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne
 Ellis, Joseph, Ribbleson, Lancaster, Brickmaker. May 29 at 3 at offices of Backhurst, Fox st, Preston
 Elson, William, jun, Lincoln, Cattle Dealer. May 27 at 2.30 at offices of Toynbee & Co, Bank st, Lincoln
 Fink, Peter, Bedford terrace, Holloway, Baker. May 30 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane
 Foster, John, Nottingham, Saddler. June 5 at 12 at offices of Clifton, St Peter's chambers, Nottingham
 Freemantle, James, Farnham, Surrey, Grocer. May 30 at 12 at 164, Fleet st, London. Geach, Guildford
 Gee, George, Cockshot Billinge, nr Wigan, Blacksmith. May 29 at 3 at offices of Oppe-heim, Hardshaw st, St. Helen's
 Gibson, Henry, Wigan, Southampton, Bailiff. May 28 at 12 at offices of Coxwell, High st, Lymington
 Glover, Thomas, Chesterton, Stafford, Painter. May 24 at 11 at offices of Tennant and Co, Cheap-side, Hanley
 Gordon, Thomas, Hyde st, Oxford, Licensed Victualler. May 26 at 3 at offices of Kisch, Argyll pl, Regent st
 Green, Henry Meredith Wilson, Liverpool, Metal Broker. May 27 at 2 at offices of Dixon and Sayers, Lord st, Liverpool
 Grimley, Charles, Parkstone rd, Peckham, Plumber. May 26 at 2 at offices of Parke, Warwick ct, Gray's inn
 Grosvenor, William Charles, Lower Piddilton, Hereford, Farmer. May 29 at 1.30 at the Royal Oak, Leominster. Garrold, Hereford
 Halliday, John, Dewsbury, Wool Merchant. May 26 at 3 at offices of Shaw, Bond st, Dewsbury
 Hancock, James, Manchester, Packing Case Maker. May 30 at 3 at offices of Hinds and Co, Mount st, Albert sq, Manchester
 Harris, Julius, and Montague Harris, Liverpool, Dealers in Fancy Goods. June 4 at 2 at offices of Pemberton and Co, Harrington st, Liverpool
 Harrison, Elisha, Australian avenue, Jewin crescent, Licensed Victualler. May 26 at 2 at the Masons' Hall Tavern, Masons' avenue. Buchanan and Rogers, Basinghall st
 Hart, Lemon, Great Tower st, Commercial Clerk. June 4 at 2 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Michael, Great Winchester st
 Hawes, William Christopher, Northampton, Music Seller. May 26 at 1 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Jeffery, Northampton
 Hawkins, Alfred, Selly Oak, Worcester, Grocer. May 28 at 3 at offices of Fallows, Cherry st, Birmingham
 Heworth, Arthur, Wombwell, York, Butcher. May 28 at 11 at offices of Gray, Eastgate, Barnsley
 Hewott, James, Caston, Norfolk, Plumber. May 24 at 3 at offices of Stanley, Bank Plain, Norwich
 Higginbotham, Elizabeth, Macolesfield, Saddler. May 30 at 3 at offices of Barclay and Henstock, Exchange chambers, Macolesfield
 Hirst, George, Hurst Green, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. May 28 at 11.30 at the Old Bull Hotel, Church st, Blackburn. Eastham, Clitheroe
 Hodge, William Frederick, Devoran, Cornwall, Ship Owner. May 27 at 3 at offices of Hodde and Co, Pydar st, Truro
 Holden, James, Edgworth, Lancaster, Paper Manufacturer. June 10 at 3 at the Mitre Hotel, Cathedral yard, Manchester. Polding, Blackburn

Holdsworth, Henry, and Joseph Holdsworth, Batley Carr, York. Flock Merchants. June 4 at 10.30 at offices of Fyler, Church st, Dewsbury.

Howell, Thomas, Bristol, Bransfunder. May 27 at 1 at offices of Bedell, Clare st, Bristol.

Harrell, Robert, Lower Thames st, Carman. May 24 at 10 at the Foresters Arms, Black man st, Borough. Fowler, Blackman st.

Hutchinson, William, Liverpool, Plumber. May 10 at 2 at offices of Harris, Adelaide build ings, Ranelagh pl, Liverpool.

Jackson, Henry, Stretoford, Leather, Timber Merchant. May 29 at 3 at the Palestine Hotel, Hunt's back, Manchester. McKewen, Manchester.

Jones, William, Tanygrisiau, Merioneth, Tailor. May 30 at 2 at the Albion Hotel, Chester. Ellis, Four Crosses, Festinog.

Juddins, Catherine, Fleet st, Sewing Machine Manufacturer. June 9 at 3 at the Guildhall Tavern, Gresham st. Chorley and Co, Moor-gate st.

Kendrick, Joseph, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Grocer. May 27 at 2 at offices of Hopper, Grainger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

King, Horace, Graffon rd, Kenish Town, Hardwareman. May 30 at 3 at offices of Munns and Longdon, Old Jewry.

Kitcher, Frank, Hastings, Upholsterer. May 28 at 11 at the Bridge House Hotel, London Bridge. Langham, Hastings.

Lake, Charles Nicholson, Rawcliffe, York, Malster. May 31 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Wood st, Wakefield. Clark, Smith.

Leopard, George Henry, Middleborough, Innkeeper. May 28 at 2 at the Zealand Hotel, Zealand rd, Middleborough. Teale, Middleborough.

Lewis, Jenkin, Resolven, Glamorgan, Grocer. May 27 at 12 at Temple st, Swansea. Thomas.

Lloyd, Joseph, Birmingham, Coach Builder. May 30 at 11 at offices of Walford, Waterloo st, Birmingham.

Lund, Thomas, and John Lund, Fleming, Lancaster, Mineral Water Manufacturer. May 28 at 3 at offices of Blackhurst, Fox st, Preston.

Marshall, Herbert James, Banbury, Oxford, Commission Agent. May 27 at 2 at offices of Pain and Hawtin, Bridge st, Banbury.

McIntosh, John, Redcar, York, Baker. May 29 at 3 at offices of Peacock, Zealand road, Middleborough.

McLean, John William, Liverpool, Greenroper. May 27 at 3 at offices of Browne, Victoria st, Liverpool.

Mead, Thomas, and William Fankner, Northampton, Shoe Manufacturers. May 30 at 3 at Peacock Hotel, Northampton. Andrew, Northampton.

Millward, George, Redditch, Fruiturer. May 27 at 3 at offices of Maunders, Moor st, Birmingham.

Millward, John, Liverpool, Licensed Victualler. June 6 at 2 at offices of Harris, Union court, Liverpool.

Miner, Joseph, Irmingham, Boot and Shoe Dealer. May 27 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham.

Mitchell, Sarah, Allan Mitchell, and Alonso Mitchell, Orsett, York, Mungo Merchants. May 29 at 11.30 at Royal Hotel, Dewsbury.

Wainwright and Mason, Wakefield.

Mitcheson, John, North Shields, Licensed Victualler. May 29 at 11 at offices of Kewen-y, Howard st, North Shields.

Morgan, John, Wolverhampton, Lubricator. May 31 at 12 at offices of Rudland, Queen st, Wolverhampton.

Morris, Henry, Llanfyllin, Carnarvon, Joiner. May 30 at 3 at Castle Hotel, Car arvon. Jones and Roberts, Carnarvon.

Morris, Joseph, Queen st, Worship st, Cabinet Manufacturer. May 29 at 3 at offices of Widdicombe, Metropolitan chambers, Broad st.

Myers, John, Cardigan, out of business. May 28 at 10.30 at offices of Collins, Broad st, Bristol. Griffith, Carmarthen.

Overton, Charles Peet, Ashby-by-Parney, Lincoln, Farmer. May 26 at 3 at offices of Walker and Co, Solihby.

Owen, Arthur, Walsham, Tenby, Fombroke, Gent. May 31 at 10.30 at offices of Mathia-Thomas, Crickwell st, Tenby.

Pardoe, Thomas, Worcester, Plumber. May 28 at 3 at offices of Allen and Co, Sion-combe place, Worcester.

Peacock, William Joseph, Little Chesterford, Essex, Tin Plate, Worker. May 29 at 3 at Red Cow, Guildhall st, Cambridge. Cooper, Chancery lane, London.

Penman, William, Gateshead, Durham, Coal Merchant. May 26 at 12 at offices of Hopper, Grainger st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Pepper, George Stephenson, Moss Side, Manchester, Pork Butcher. May 29 at 3 at Falsafi Hotel, Market place, Manchester. Clemmet, Manchester.

Pickard, Joel, Dewsbury, Bootmaker. May 31 at 12 at King's Arms Hotel, Market place, Dewsbury. Walker and Son, Dewsbury.

Pitcher, William Michael, Cheltenham, Gloucester, Bootmaker. May 28 at 11 at offices of Froen, Regent st, Cheltenham.

Pitt, George Frederick, Georgian st, Camden town, Commercial Clerk. May 28 at 1 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane.

Pogson, Seth, Gorton, Lancaster, Engine Driver. June 4 at 2 at Falsafi Hotel, Market place, Manchester. Trem-wen, Manchester.

Poole, Eleazar, Long lane, West Smithfield, Bootmaker. May 29 at 2 at offices of Mammullen, Prad st, Paddington.

Porteus, James Linton Purdie, Bradford, out of business. May 29 at 11 at offices of Beverley, Haverlodge, Bradford.

Price, Edward, Bradford, York, Stationer. May 26 at 11 at offices of Gardiner and Jeffery, Bond st, Bradford.

Price, Thomas, Pentre, Glamorgan, Woollen Draper. May 29 at 3 at Royal Hotel, Cardiff. Morgan, Pontypridd.

Reed, Thomas, Chatham, Hatter. June 5 at 3 at Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st. Piesse and Son, Old Jewry chambers.

Raid, William, Leeds, Furniture Broker. May 29 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Barrell, Albion st, Leeds.

Rectorick, George, Axminster, Devon, Grocer. May 29 at 3 at Castle Hotel, Castle st, Exeter. Flood, Exeter.

Richardson, Edmund, Liverpool, Foreman, to a Tea Dealer. June 9 at 3 at offices of Pemberton and Co, Harrington st, Liverpool.

Riley, Abraham, Bafford, York, Grocer. May 28 at 11 at offices of Peel and Grant, Chapel lane, Bradford.

Roberts, John, Liverpool, Commission Agent. May 30 at 12 at offices of Carruthers, Lord st, Liverpool.

Roberts, Thomas, Fourcrosses, near Pwllhel, Carnarvon, Flour Dealer. June 2 at 1 at Sportsman Hotel, Carnarvon. Roberts, Portmadoc.

Robinson, William Thomas, and George Robinson, Leeds, Woollen Merchants. May 29 at 3 at offices of Cousins, Bank chambers, Park row, Leeds.

Sales, Henry Hamblenn, Haddingley, York, out of business. May 28 at 3 at the Law Institute, Albon place, Leeds. Blier.

Saunders, Alfred, Whitchurch, Bants, Tailor. May 24 at 1 at the Three Swans Hotel, Winchester st, Salisbury. Whaiman, Salisbury.

Seaby, Wright, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Wine Merchant. May 26 at 11 at the rooms of the Incorporated Law Society, Royal arcade, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Phillips.

Shaw, John, Highgate rd, Kentish Town rd, out of business. June 4 at 3 at offices of Payne and Henry, Lorbury.

Shaw, William Henry, Skelmersdale, Lancaster, Painter. May 30 at 11 at offices of Stuart, King st, Wigan.

Shores, George, Armley, nr Leeds, Shoe Manufacturer. May 29 at 3 at offices of Billinton, Bank st, Leeds.

Sialing, William, Nottingham, Leather Dealer. May 30 at 12 at offices of Thorpe and Thorpe, Friar lane, Nottingham.

Small, John, Sunderland, Innkeeper. May 30 at 3 at offices of Bell, Lambton st, Sunderland.

Smallwood, Thomas, Cymmau, Flint, Farmer. May 28 at 10 at offices of Sherratt, Regent st, Wrexham.

Smith, Charles, Barrow-in-Furness, Coal Dealer. May 26 at 2 at the Victoria Hotel, Church st, Barrow-in-Furness. Jackson, Ulverston.

Smith, Joshua, Corbridge, Northumberland, Farmer. May 27 at 3 at offices of Sewell, Grey st, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Smith, Ormerod, Accrington, Lancaster, Tailor. May 28 at 11 at offices of Milnes, New st, Huddersfield.

Smithies, James, Middleton, Lancaster, Manufacturer of Hatters' Trimmings. May 28 at 3 at offices of Raison and Grandy, Princess st, Manchester.

Stevenson, Richard, Nottingham, Builder. May 30 at 3 at the Assembly Rooms, Low pavement, Nottingham. Eversal and Turner, Nottingham.

Taylor, Hcratio, Barrow-in-Furness, Grocer. June 6 at 11 at the Sun Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Sims, Barrow-in-Furness.

Thomas, Griffith, Pontypridd, Flannel Dealer. May 27 at 10 at offices of Rosser, High st, Pontypridd.

Thompson, Hargreaves, Huddersfield, Traveller. May 28 at 3 at offices of Schofield and Taylor, Brunswick st, Batley.

Toplias, Abel William, Barnsley, Commission Agent. May 29 at 11 at offices of Senior, Regent st, Barnsley.

Truchler, Ferdinand Henry, Calisla, Jeweller. May 30 at 3 at the Midland Hotel, New st, Birmingham. Wainop, Carlisle.

Ward, Arthur, Batley Carr, York, R-g Merchant. May 29 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgway and Ridgway, Union st, Dewsbury.

Ward, Charles Robert, Greenwich, Manager to a Licensed Victualler. May 26 at 3 at offices of Laidman, Serjeant's inn, Temple.

Wardle, David, Claremont, Halifax, B oush-keeper. May 29 at 11 at offices of Terry and Robinson, Market st, Bradford.

Watson, Elizabeth, Fleet st, Licensed Victualler. May 26 at 10.30 at Dick's Hotel, Fleet st. Joyce, Devonex chambers, Temple.

Welch, James, Hanley, Grocer. May 28 at 10 at offices of Ashmall, Albion st, Hanley.

Whites, John, Mountsorrell, Leicester, Beerhouse Keeper. June 3 at 12 at offices of Goode and Clifford, Baxter gate, Loughborough.

Wigson, John Woolston, Austrey, Warwick, Farmer. May 30 at 11 at offices of Nevill and Atkins, Colehill, Tamworth.

Wile x, Herbert Francis, Sunderland, Steam-hill Owner. May 29 at 3 at 32, John st, Sunderland. Sim-y, Sand-rand.

Willie, George William Crick, Woodford, Essex, Builder. May 31 at 2 at offices of Evans, John st, Bedford row.

Wood, John, Queen's crescent, Haverstock Hill, Hardware Dealer. May 29 at 4 at 7, Bouverie st, Fleet st. Paterson and Co.

Woodlands, George, Wimbledon, Surrey, Builder. June 3 at 2 at offices of Harrey, Basinghall st. Mont-gu, Backersbury.

Woods, William, Gar ton, Lancaster, Licensed Victualler. May 30 at 12 at offices of Gushaw, Lord st, Liverpool.

Wren, Augustus Burney, Birkenhead, Veterinary Surgeon. May 29 at 2 at offices of Francis, Hamilton sq, Birkenhead.

TUESDAY, May 20, 1879.

Andrew, Ralph, Manchester, Merchant. June 10 at 3 at offices of Grundy and Co, Booth st, Manchester.

Ball, Edwin William, Birmingham, Ironfounder. May 30 at 12 at offices of Beaton and Robinson, Dutch st, Birmingham.

Bannister, Hugh, Barrow-in-Furness, Timber Merchant. June 12 at 11 at the Imperial Hotel, Barrow-in-Furness. Park and Mansfield, Barrow-in-Furness.

Barrett, Matthew Richard, Golden lane, Bow, Licensed Victualler. June 4 at 12 at offices of Brown and Co, King st, Uttoxdale. Neave, Cheapside.

Bartlett, William Stephen James, Gildford, Dairyman. June 3 at 3 at Anderson's Hotel, Fleet st, London. Geach, Guildford.

Beaumont, George, Birmingham, Carpenter. May 30 at 11 at offices of Foster, Bonnet's hill, Birmingham.

Bere, Jane, and Thomas Barnard Bere, Lapford, Devon, Farmers. May 20 at 11 at offices of Fowling, Queens st, Exeter. Scorie, Crediton.

Bernstein, Abraham, Basinghall st, Trimming Manufacturer. June 9 at 3 at offices of Lee, Gresham buildings, Basinghall st.

Boorman, Charles, Streton-upon-Fosse, Warwick, Grocer. May 28 at 11 at the Crown Hotel, Bl-chey. Barnes, Moret-in-Marsh.

Bor-n, Adolph Emil, Vere st, Oxford st, Goldsmith. June 5 at 12 at offices of Crump and Son, Philip lane.

Boston, George, Coventry, Tailor. May 29 at 12 at offices of Peirson, Jordan wall, Coventry. Seymour.

Bridgett, John, Stonehouse, Stafford, Stone Mason. May 28 at 11 at offices of Kent, Chancery lane, London.

Briggs, Robert, Blackburn, Cabinet Maker. June 5 at 3 at the Queen's Hotel, Townhall st, Blackburn. Holland, Blackburn.

Bromfield, Henry, Worcester, Wine Merchant. May 31 at 3 at offices of Thompson and Taylor, Pierpoint st, Worcester.

Brown, John Young, Sunderland, Sailmaker. May 20 at 11 at offices of Brown and Son, Villiers st, Sunderland.

Burrows, Thomas, Barrow, Plumber. June 5 at 3 at the Royal Hotel, Church st, Barnsley. Marshall and Owsnworth, Barnsley.

Caldecott, Geoffrey, Wrexham, Den igh, Tailor. May 30 at 12 at offices of Cartwright, Pepper st, Chester.

Campbell, Thomas, Longton, Beerhouse Keeper. May 28 at 3 at the Copelan Arms Hotel, Stoke-upon-Trent. Hollishead, Tunstall.

- Carrier, William Henry, Wolverhampton, Builder. July 5 at 11 at offices of Willock, Queen st, Wolverhampton
- Chadwick, Thomas, Bolton, Gent. June 9 at 3 at offices of Taylor and Sons, Mawdsley st, Bolton
- Charlton, James Skiddle, West Hertlepool, Merchants Clerk. May 28 at 11.30 at offices of Todd, Church st, West Hertlepool
- Chrelman, George Thomas, Cheltenham, Carver. June 4 at 11 at offices of Pruett, Regent st, Cheltenham
- Cockburn, George William, Haymarket, Commission Agent. July 14 at 3 at the Charing Cross Terminus Hotel, Strand. Duncan and Co, Bloomsbury sq
- Cohen, Lewis, Grace's alley, Wells st east. Outfitter. May 29 at 3 at offices of Barnett, Palmerston buildings, Old Broad st
- Collis, William, and Jane Jemina Collis, Southampton, Bootmakers. May 30 at 11 at offices of Davis, Portland st, Southampton. Perkins and Candy, Southampton
- Coo, William, Leeds, Auctioneer. May 30 at 1 at offices of Rooke and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds
- Cooke, William, Ferry hill, Durham, Joiner. June 6 at 11.30 at offices of Salkeld, Elvet bridge, Durham
- Cox, James, Barrow-in-Furness, Builder. June 4 at 2 at 17, Strand, Barrow-in-Furness. Taylor, Barrow-in-Furness
- Craver, Matthew Smith, and William Smith Craven, Kingston-upon-Hull, Wood Turners. May 30 at 11 at the Imperial Hotel, Paragon st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Woodhouse and Peach, Kingston-upon-Hull
- Daniel, William, Wigan, Draper. June 3 at 11.30 at offices of France, Church gate, Wigan
- Darbo, John Warren, High st, Brentford, Stationer. May 30 at 1 at offices of Fairbairn and Owen, Westminster chambers, Victoria st
- Davis, Thomas Holmes, Lewisham, Wine Merchant. June 3 at 2 at offices of Linklater and Co, Walbrook, London
- Dawson, Frederick William, Lower Broughton, Lancashire, Merchant. June 9 at 3 at offices of Best, Ridgefield, Manchester
- Dwens, Denis Sidney, Kentish Town rd, Surgeon. May 29 at 2 at offices of Scott, King William st
- Dutton, George, Strangeways, Manchester, Horse Dealer. June 3 at 11 at offices of Blakeway, Desnagate, Manchester
- Edwards, James Mainwaring, and William Benson, Birmingham, Iron Merchants. June 3 at 11 at the Queen's Hotel, Stephenson pl, Birmingham. Deignan and Co, Walsall
- Elkington, Christopher, New England, Northampton, Publican. June 5 at 12 at offices of Gaches, Cathedral gateway, Peterborough
- Emanuel, John, Brittonferry, nr Neath, Pilot. May 29 at 11 at offices of Davies, Alma pl, Neath
- Emmels, Eliza Ann, Harwich, Butcher. June 13 at 2 at the Pier Hotel, Harwich. Pollard, Ipswich
- Evans, William, Pontycaetes, Carmarthen, Draper. June 4 at 10.15 at office of Griffiths, St Mary st, Carmarthen
- Fallows, William, Manchester, Potato Salesman. May 30 at 3 at offices of Heath and Sons, Swan st, Manchester
- Felhm, James, 3, Wand, Richmond, bootmaker. May 29 at 3 at offices of Wood, Fish st hill
- Fisher, William, St. effield, Iron Broker. May 30 at 12 at the Rooms of the Incorporated Law Society, Aldno ct, High st, Sheffield. Watson and Esam
- Ford, Jonas Robert, West Hertlepool, Timber Merchant. June 6 at 3 at offices of Bell, Church st, West Hertlepool
- Giller, Hermann, Rattray rd, Brixton, Fancy Leather Case Maker. May 30 at 2 at offices of Morris, Carter lane, Doctors commons
- Glaves, Thomas Wyndham Lewis, Cardiff, Brewer. June 5 at 1 at offices of Tribe and Co, Abion chambers, Bristol. Williams, Cardiff
- God-on, William, West Gorton, Manchester, Joiner. May 29 at 3 at offices of Sumner, Marsden st, Manchester
- Gooden, Richard Henry, Thomas Varley, and Samuel Brentnall, Manchester, Bleachers. June 11 at 2 at offices of Addleshaw and Warburton, Norfolk ct, Manchester
- Grave, John, Winslow, Buckinham, Builder. May 31 at 11 at the White Hart Hotel, Buckingham. Whitehorn, Banbury
- Graves, Maria, Firby, York, Farmer. June 2 at 12.30 at offices of Teale, Market pl, Bedale. Jefferson, Northallerton
- Gray, William, Kingston-upon-Hull, Cooper. June 4 at 3 at the White Hart Hotel, Silver st, Kingston-upon-Hull. Iveson and Son, Kingston-upon-Hull
- Grey, Robert Ralph, Rochdale, Schoolmaster. May 30 at 2.30 at offices of Brierley, Butt's avenue, Rochdale
- Hal, Joseph, Leeds, Cloth Manufacturer. June 4 at 3 at the Law Institution, Albion pl, Leeds. Nelson and Co
- Hanson, John Hopkins, Linton, Derby, Farmer. May 30 at 3 at offices of Jennings and Burton, High st, Burton-upon-Trent
- Hartley, David, Whitehaven, Ironmonger. May 30 at 12 at offices of Ait, New Lowther st, Whitehaven
- Hayward, David, Peole, Draper. June 3 at 2 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn, London. Dickinson
- Hems, Thomas, Forston st, City rd, Carman. June 4 at 3 at offices of Pannell and Co, Girdlers' Hall chambers, Basinghall st. Beard and Sons, Basinghall st
- Hilbert, Thomas, Manchester, Woollen Rag Merchant. June 10 at 3 at 1, St Peter's sq, Manchester. Sale and Co, Manchester
- Hinder, George, Alfred Hinder, John Hinder, and Eli Hinder, Bristol, Boot Manufacturers. May 30 at 2 at offices of Sibby, Exchange west, Bristol
- Hockley, William, Birmingham, Draper. May 29 at 12 at offices of Smith, Temple st, Birmingham
- Hooey, George Marshall, Sevenoaks, Wine Merchant. June 3 at 12 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn, Middlesex. Phillips, Hastings
- Hooey, Giles, Treherbert, Glamorgan, Grocer. June 3 at 12 at offices of Morgan, Mill st, Pontypridd
- Humfrey, James, Havestock hill, of no occupation. May 31 at 11 at Muller's Hotel, Ironmonger lane, Chesapeake. Holland, St. Faith's lane
- Humphrey, William, and Henry James Schoobrod, Manchester, Merchants. May 30 at 4.30 at offices of Sale and Co, Booth st, Manchester
- Irgle, James, Leeds, Joiner. May 30 at 11 at offices of Rooke and Midgley, White Horse st, Boar lane, Leeds
- Ingram, Evan, Bangor, Carnarvon, Bookseller. June 10 at 2 at the Liverpool Arms Hotel, Chester. Roberts, Bangor
- Inman, John, and Thomas Inman, Walton, York, Farmers. June 6 at 3 at the Angel Hotel, Wetherby. Coates and Son, Wetherby
- Irish, David, Kidsgrove, Stafford, Provision Dealer. May 30 at 3 at offices of Hollinshead, Tursall
- Ison, John, Wellington, Salop, Grocer. June 4 at 2 at the Great Western Hotel, Birmingham. Newill, Wellington
- Jones, Edward, Manchester, Tailor. May 30 at 12 at the Falstaff Hotel, Manchester. Ambler, Manchester
- Jones, Hugh, Tze Brook, nr Liverpool, Draper. June 3 at 3 at offices of Lupion, Harrington st, Liverpool
- Jones, Ralph Milburn, Essex rd, Cheesemonger. June 9 at 2 at offices of Tanner, Circus place, Finsbury circus
- Jones, Samuel Walter, Kingsdown, Bristol, Painter. May 30 at 11 at offices of Sibby, Exchange West, Bristol
- Kent, David, Kiosop, Dorset, Builder. May 30 at 11 at offices of Barrett, Hill st, Poole
- Kiddle, Andrew Webster (not Hiddle as previously printed), Southport, Joiner. May 22 at 11 at offices of Walton and Smith, Devonshire buildings, East Bank st, Southport
- Kilbourn, Samuel, Walsall, Stafford, Harness Manufacturer. May 30 at 3 at offices of Cotterell, Bridge st, Walsall
- Kinsey, Henry, Petworth, Sussex, Tailor. June 6 at 11.30 at the Inns of Court Hotel, Holborn. Mant, Stenington
- Leach, Thomas, Salford, Lancashire, Provision Dealer. June 10 at 3 at offices of Evans, Albert rd, Manchester
- Leigard, Alfred, St George's rd, Southwark, Publican. June 5 at 2 at offices of Cruise and Co, Lancaster place, Strand
- Leoch, William, Victoria rd, Hackney Wick, Chemist. June 2 at 3 at offices of Holloway, Ball's Pond rd. Cooper, Chancery lane
- Lewis, Thomas, Ludlow, Salop, Baker. June 4 at 11 at offices of Weyman, Mill st, Ludlow
- Lewis, William, Caspibilly, Glamorgan, Innkeeper. May 30 at 12 at offices of Cousins, St Mary's st, Cardiff
- Ligwood, Charles William, Leamington, Warwick, Coach Builder. June 3 at 3 at offices of Wright and Hassall, Dorman place, Leamington
- Lingham, Henry, Cobham, Kent, Beerhouse keeper. June 3 at 3 at offices of Bassett, Eastgate, Rochester
- Lloyd, John Leon, Wednesbury, Stafford, Ironmonger. June 6 at 3 at offices of Tinsley, Priory st, Dudley
- Matthers, Frederick, and John Harrison, Leeds, Cloth Finishers. May 30 at 3 at offices of Simpson and Burrell, Albion st, Leeds
- Maxwell, Peter, Boston, Lincoln, Physician. June 3 at 11 at offices of Yarborough, Church st, Boston
- May, William, Brierley hill, Stafford, Beerhouse keeper. May 30 at 3 at offices of Stokes and Harper, Priory st, Dudley
- McGill, George, Bristol, Mason. May 30 at 11 at offices of Hulbert, High st, Bristol
- McKie, Robert Alexander, Manchester, Boot Maker. May 30 at 3 at offices of Walker, St Ann st, Manchester
- Middleton, William Henry, High st, Stoke Newington, Lead Merchant. June 5 at 3 at offices of Andrews and Mason, Ironmonger lane, Cheapside. Barrett, John st, Bedford row
- Moat, Elijah, Southport, Ironmonger. May 30 at 3 at offices of Threlfall, London st, Southport
- Morgan, John William, Pontyccymmer, Cwmawr, Glamorgan, Builder. June 6 at 1 at offices of Morgan and Scott, High st, Cardiff
- Motte, Arthur Clarendon, Leicester, Upholterer. June 5 at 12 at offices of Harvey, Selborne buildings, Millstone lane, Leicester
- Nokes, James Stodley, Tharlington, York, Woollen Cloth Manufacturer. June 5 at 3 at the George Hotel, Huddersfield d. Dransfield, Penistone, nr Sheffield
- O'Brien, Eugene, Liverpool, Baker. June 4 at 3 at offices of Yates and Co, Water st, Liverpool
- Oppenheim, Joseph Guttmann, Leeds, Woollen Draper. May 31 at 12 at the Law Institution, Albion place, Leeds. Lodge, Leeds
- Osborne, Harry, Birmingham, Beer Retailer. May 30 at 3 at offices of Jaques, Cherry st, Birmingham
- Parker, George Croft, Great Grimsby, Butcher. May 30 at 11 at the Dolphin Hotel, Cleethorpe. Watts
- Pinkney, William, Barton, York, Sheep Doctor. June 4 at 11 at offices of Wooler, Priestgate, Burlington
- Pocknall, George, sen, South Darenth, Kent, Farmer. June 6 at 3 at the Chequers Inn, Darenth. Gibson, Dartford
- Pugh, William, Wem, Salop, Tailor. June 2 at 12.30 at offices of Bygott, High st, Wem
- Raine, John Pearson, Marple, Cheshire, Shroud Manufacturer. June 2 at 3 at offices of Harris, Blue Boar ct, Manchester
- Hopkins, William Randolph Innes, Isaac Wilson, and Edgar Gilkes, Middlesborough, Iron Masters. May 30 at 11 at the Queen Hotel, Zetland rd, Middlesborough. Dadds and Co, Stockton-on-Tees
- Read, Walter Edwin, Coventry, Licensed Victualler. May 29 at 11 at offices of Hughes and Masser, Little Park st, Coventry
- Reynolds, John, Haverly, Berks, Plumber. May 29 at 11 at the Bell Hotel, Maidenhead. Batzine, Great Marlow
- Richards, Richard Moore, and Robert William Himmer, Manchester, Merchants. June 11 at 3 at offices of Boule and Edgar, Booth st, Manchester
- Righton, William John, Euston rd, Zinc Worker. June 4 at 3 at offices of Lane, Gresham st
- Rippling, John, Jan, Geddington, Northampton, Wood Dealer. June 3 at 2 at the George Hotel, Kettering. Freely, Kettering
- Robinson, Aaron, sen, Chesterfield, Colliery Proprietor. May 28 at 3 at offices of Cutts, Market Hall chambers, Chesterfield
- Robinson, Aaron, Helmsley, York, Farmer. June 6 at 2 at the Court house, Helmsley. Pearson, Helmsley
- Robinson, Greenwood, Kingston-upon-Hull, Builder. June 4 at 11 at offices of Mends and Penny, Parliament st, Kingston-upon-Hull
- Rogerson, Jonathan, Blackburn, Licensed Victualler. May 30 at 11 at offices of Radcliffe, Clayton st, Blackburn
- Rose, Josiah, Leigh, Lancashire, Newspaper Proprietor. June 3 at 3 at the Court Hotel, Church st, Leigh. Marsh and Son, Leigh
- Rose, William, Marshall, Dorset, Beerhouse keeper. June 9 at 2 at the Swan Inn, Sturminster Newton. Atkinson, Blandford
- Rouse, Orbel Ezra, Bury st Edmunds, Timman. June 7 at 12 at the Guildhall Coffee house, London. Leech, Jun

Saunders, Frederick, Shanklin, Isle of Wight, Corn Merchant. June 3 at 3 at the Star Hotel, Newport. Damant
 Scottorn, William, Nottingham, Hosiery Manufacturer. June 4 at 11 at offices of Wells and Hind, Fletcher gate, Nottingham
 Seward, Frederick John, and William Norris, Frome, Somerset, Builders. June 4 at 1 at offices of Dunn and Payne, King st, Frome
 Sheppard, Thomas William, Deptford, Kent, Tool Dealer. June 4 at 4 at offices of Parkes, Queen Victoria st
 Silvester, Frederick, Smeethwick, Stafford, Coal Merchant. June 5 at 11 at offices of Jackson, High st, West Bromwich
 Simpson, Joseph, Shoe lane, News Agent. June 9 at 3 at offices of Cooper, Chancery lane
 Singleton, George, Richmond, Surrey, Tailor. June 5 at 10 at offices of Jones, Bank buildings, Wandsworth
 Smith, Albert, Bradford, York, Grocer. May 31 at 10 at the Creditors' Association, Parkinson's chambers, Market st, Bradford
 Smith, David, Mountain Ash, Glamorgan, Provision Merchant. June 2 at 3 the Queen's Hotel, St Mary st, Cardiff. Phillips, Aberdare
 Smith, Edward, North Shields, Draper. May 30 at 11 at offices of Kewney, Howard st, North Shields
 Smith, James, Bolton, Lancashire, Grocer. June 2 at 3 at offices of Dutton, Hotel st, Bolton
 Spanton, William, Nonington, Kent, Farmer. June 5 at 3 at the Royal Oak Hotel, Dover. Mowll, Dover
 Starmer, Thomas, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer. June 6 at 12 at the Angel Hotel, Bridge st Northampton. Wright and Hinks, Leicester
 Summercales, Robert, Thornhill Edge, nr Dewsbury, Boerhouse keeper. May 30 at 10.30 at offices of Ridgway and Ridgway, Union st, Dewsbury
 Sutcliffe, Booth, Halifax, Engineers' Tool Maker. June 3 at 11 at the White Swan Hotel, Princess st, Halifax. Longbottom, Halifax
 Swann, Robert, Ashkam Richard, William Clough, and Frances Elizabeth Swann, York, Bankers. June 5 at 11 at Harker's Hotel, York. Smithson and Son, York
 Tyeo, John, Coventry, Boot Maker. May 27 at 12 at offices of Burgess, Berridge st, Leicester. Kilby, Coventry
 Udell, William Clayton, Brockley rd, New Cross, out of business. May 30 at 2 at offices of Wedlake and Letts, Mitre ct, Temple
 Volsey, William Clark, Bristol, Bootmaker. June 5 at 2 at offices of Phillips, Corn st, Bristol. Salmon, Bristol
 Waite, Samuel, Bradford, York, Bookseller. May 30 at 2 at offices of Robinson and Robinson, Keighley
 Ward, Alfred Harrison, Swindon, York, Grocer. June 4 at 1 at the Lowther Hotel, Goolie. Stad and Sibree, Hull
 Warren, Thomas, New Herrington, Durham, Grocer. June 10 at 1 at the Neville Hotel, Newcastle-upon-Tyne. Wilkes, Darlington
 Watson, Christopher, Black Hill, Durham, Timber Merchant. June 5 at 11 at offices of Brodie, Townhall, Consett. Welford, Jun, Consett
 Wells, William, Ramsgate, Ironmonger. June 7 at 2 at the Guildhall Coffee house, Gresham st, London. Sparks, Ramsgate
 Westerman, Charles, Huddersfield, Rug Manufacturer. May 31 at 11 at offices of Bottomley, New st, Huddersfield
 Whitworth, Philip Henry, Kingston-upon-Hull, Yeast Merchant. May 30 at 3 at offices of Jackson, Imperial chambers, Bowinlay lane. Kingston-upon-Hull
 Wilby, Joseph, Ossett, York, Fruit Dealer. June 3 at 3 at offices of Burton, Wood st, Wakefield
 Wilde, George, Holme-upon-Spalding Moor, York, Farmer. June 4 at 12 at offices of Shaw, Howden
 Williams, John, Trebnow, Glamorgan, Grocer. June 5 at 12 at offices of Rosser, High st, Pontypool
 Williams, William, Fwibell, Carnarvon, Grocer. June 5 at 12 at the Queen's Hotel, Chester. Owen, Fwibell
 Winterbottom, Edwin, Manchester, Coal Merchant. June 4 at 3 at the Townhall chambers, Ashton-under-Lyne. Bradbury
 Worrall, Henry, Walsall, Stafford, Saddler. June 4 at 11 at offices of Cotterell, Bridge st, Walsall

SCHWEITZER'S COCOATINA,

Anti-Dyspeptic Cocoa or Chocolate Powder.

Guaranteed Pure Soluble Cocoa of the Finest Quality, with the excess of fat extracted.

The Faculty pronounce it "the most nutritious, perfectly digestible beverage for Breakfast, Luncheon, or Supper, and invaluable for Invalids and Children."

Highly commended by the entire Medical Press.

Being without sugar, spice, or other admixture, it suits all palates, keeps better in all climates, and is four times the strength of cocoa thickened yet weakened with starch, &c., and IN REALITY CHEAPER than such Mixtures.

Made instantaneously with boiling water, a teaspoonful to a Breakfast Cup, costing less than a halfpenny.

COCOATINA A LA VANILLE is the most delicate, digestible, cheapest Vanilla Chocolate, and may be taken when richer chocolate is prohibited.

In tin packets at 1s. 6d., 3s., &c., by Chemists and Grocers. Charities on Special Terms by the Sole Proprietors, H. SCHWEITZER & CO., 19, Adam-street, London, W.C.

PAINLESS DENTISTRY.

MR. G. H. JONES,
SURGEON DENTIST,

57, GREAT RUSSELL-STREET, BLOOMSBURY
(Immediately opposite the British Museum).

Will be glad to forward his new Pamphlet gratis and post-free, which explains the only perfectly painless system of adapting ARTIFICIAL TEETH (protected by Her Majesty's Royal Letters Patent), which have obtained five Prize Medals, London 1862, Paris 1867, Philadelphia 1876, Vienna 1873, and New York 1853.—Consultation daily free.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that Schedules of Estates under the charge of the Administrators-General of Bengal, Madras, and Bombay, respectively, for the half year ending 30th June, 1878, have been received, and are open to the inspection of the public in my Department of this Office.

A list of sums remitted by the several Administrators-General and Official Trustees previously to 1st January, 1878, for payment in this country, which remain unclaimed, is also open for inspection in my Department.

J. G. OLIPHANT,

Official Agent to Administrators-General of India.

India Office, 22nd May, 1879.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the next Half-yearly Examination for MATRICULATION in this University will commence on MONDAY, the 30th of June, 1879. In addition to the Metropolitan Examination, Provincial Examinations will be held at Owen's College, Manchester; Queen's College, Liverpool; Queen's College, Birmingham; St. Gouthbert's College, Ushaw; Stonyhurst College; St. Patrick's College, Carlisle; St. Stanislaus College, Tullamore; University College, Bristol, and (for Ladies only) at the Ladies' College, Cheltenham.

Every Candidate is required to transmit his Certificate of Age to the Registrar (University of London, Burlington Gardens, London, W.) at least Fourteen Days before the commencement of the Examination.

WILLIAM B. CARPENTER, M.D., Registrar.

May 21st, 1879.

LAWYERS' PRAYER UNION.—It is proposed to hold another Social and Religious Meeting in London for Barristers and Solicitors and their Clerks only, on THURSDAY, JUNE 12, 1879. Mr. GAINSFORD BRUCE in the Chair. Any gentleman in the Legal Profession or their Clerks who desire to attend or will assist in inviting others are requested to apply to Mr. H. C. NISBET, 35, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

A LADY wishes to recommend a Trustworthy Married Couple, without incumbrance, to take charge of a House occupied by members of the Legal Profession where the wife could act as Landdress on the usual terms.—Address to A. B., Water's Library, Westbourne-grove, Paddington, W.

FOR SALE, a Complete Set of THE LAW REPORTS, bound in calf, including the Consolidated Digest, 1864 to 1873, the Triennial Digest, 1876 to 1878, and the current year's Reports. A splendid copy. From the library of a barrister deceased.—Address "EKOR," care of Messrs. Clowes, 51, Carey-street, Lincoln's-inn, W.C.

LAW EXAMINATIONS.—MR. ALBERT ST. PAUL (M.A. Oxon), Solicitor, prepares gentlemen for their Preliminary, Intermediate, and Final Examinations, either privately, or in class. Resident pupils received.—Address, 11, Staple-inn, London, W.C.

SOLICITORS having Clients, Patrons of Church Livings, the Advertisers of which they wish to Sell, and for that purpose are desirous of presenting an aged Incumbent, may hear of such a one.—Address, "RECTOR, M.A." at the office of this paper.

ISSUE OF SECOND HALF OF CAPITAL.

HOUSE PROPERTY AND INVESTMENT COMPANY (Limited), 92, Cannon-street, London, E.C., seven doors east of the Cannon-street Station.—Capital £1,000,000, in 40,000 fully paid-up shares of £25 each, for the Purchase and Sale of productive and progressive House Property, and IMPROVING THE DWELLINGS OF THE WORKING CLASSES ON THE SELF-SUPPORTING PRINCIPLE. Registered March 15, 1876.

PROGRESS.

Estates purchased, 125, for £295,793.

Reserve Fund upwards of £27,000.

Number of Shareholders, 1,830.

Profitable re-sale made from time to time.

CAPITAL ALLOTTED.

	Shares.	Amount.
1st Issue at par.....	4,000	£100,000
2nd " £1 prem.	4,000	£100,000
3rd " £2 "	4,000	£100,000
4th " £3 "	4,000	£100,000
5th " £4 "	4,000	£100,000
6th " £5 "	500	£14,950
Total.....	20,500	£514,950

SIXTH ISSUE, 4,000, £25 each, at £5 per share premium. 598 have been already allotted, and the remainder are in course of allotment.

The present premium has been fixed to place on a fair level the old shareholders and present entrants.

Current rate of interest on Shares, SIX PER CENT.

For latest particulars, apply to W. H. BASDEN, Secretary.

EDE AND SON

ROBE MAKERS

BY SPECIAL APPOINTMENT,

To Her Majesty, the Lord Chancellor, the Whole of the Judicial Bench, Corporation of London, &c.

SOLICITORS' AND REGISTRARS' GOWNS.

BARRISTERS' AND QUEEN'S COUNSEL'S DITTO, CORPORATION ROBES UNIVERSITY & CLERGY GOWNS, &c. ESTABLISHED 1669.

94, CHANCERY LANE, LONDON.

THE STANDARD LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.—Established 1825. ANNUAL REPORT, 1879.

The FIFTY-THIRD ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of the Company was held at Edinburgh, on Tuesday, the 22nd of April, 1879, HENRY DAVIDSON, Esq., Murhouse, in the Chair, when the following results were communicated:—

Amount proposed for Assurance during the year 1878 (2,247 Proposals)	£1,432,031	0	10
Amount of Assurances accepted during the year 1878 (1,110 Policies)	1,111,065	3	4
Annual Premiums on new Policies during the year 1878	38,476	11	5
Claims by death during the year 1878, exclusive of bonus additions	430,897	13	8
Amount of Assurances accepted during the last five years	6,220,334	10	7
Subsisting Assurances at 15th November, 1878 (of which £1,309,511 13s. 6d. is Re-assured with other offices)	19,005,152	1	1
Revenue, upwards of £300,000 Sterling per annum.			
Accumulated Funds, upwards of Five Millions and a Quarter Sterling. The Report, Tables of Rates, and all further information can be obtained on application.			
Colonial and Foreign Assurances.—Assurances granted on the lives of persons residing abroad. Branch offices and agencies in India and all the British Colonies.			

H. JONES WILLIAMS, General Secretary for England.

London—82, King William-street, E.C., and 3, Pall Mall East, S.W.
Edinburgh—3 and 5, George-street (Head Office).
Dublin—66, Upper Sackville-street.

LAW UNION FIRE AND LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY. Chief Office—126, Chancery-lane, London, W.C. The Funds in hand and Capital subscribed amount to upwards of £1,500,000 sterling.

Chairman—JAMES CUDDON, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Goldsmith-build-
ing, Temple.

Deputy-Chairman—C. PEMBERTON, Esq. (Lee & Pemberton), Solicitor
44, Lincoln's-inn-fields.

Every description of Fire and Life Insurance business transacted.
The Directors invite attention to the new form of Life Policy, which is free from all conditions.

The Company advances Money on Mortgage of Life Interest and Reversions, whether absolute or contingent.
Prospectuses, Copies of the Directors' Report, and Annual Balance sheet, and every information, sent post free, on application to
FRANK M'GEDY, Actuary and Secretary.

THE NEW ZEALAND AGRICULTURAL COMPANY (Limited). Capital £1,000,000 in 50,000 Shares of £20 each. Shares already disposed of (including those allotted to the vendors) 27,233, amounting to £544,660. Amount paid up £239,665.

TRUSTEES FOR DEBENTURE HOLDERS.

Sir Daniel Cooper, Bart., Sir W. J. M. Cuninghams, Bart., M.P., and
Sir Sydney Waterlow, Bart., M.P.

DIRECTORS.

William Clark, Esq., C.E., 9, Victoria Chambers, Westminster.
W. J. Mudie Larnach, Esq., late Colonial Treasurer and Minister of
Railways, New Zealand; 118, Holland Road, Kensington, W.
Major-General Patrick Maxwell, Westmont, Ryde, I. W.
Captain R. C. Mayne, R.N., C.B., 101, Queen's Gate, South Kensington.
R. M. Robertson, Esq., 12, Stanley Gardens, Kensington Park.
T. Selby Tancred, Esq., Sheep Farmer, New Zealand; 6, Inverness
Terrace, Hyde Park.
Sir Julius Vogel, K.C.M.G., late Premier of New Zealand, 135, Crom-
well Road, South Kensington.

LOCAL BOARD, DUNEDIN.

The Hon. W. H. Reynolds, J.P., Member of the Legislative Council of
New Zealand, Director of the Colonial Bank of New Zealand.
Alfred Chesham Stode, Esq., J.P., Chairman of the Colonial Bank of
New Zealand.
G. M. Bell, Esq., J.P., Sheep Farmer.
P. K. McCaughan, Esq., J.P., Sheep Farmer.

Bankers—The Bank of England, Ireland—The Bank of Ireland.
Scotland—The Union Bank of Scotland. New Zealand—
The Bank of New South Wales.

Solicitors—Messrs. John Macfarrell & Co., 21, Cannon Street, London;
Messrs. Stewright & Stout, Dunedin.

Auditors—Messrs. Deloitte, Douer, Griffiths, & Co.

Secretary—John Scott Cavell, Esq.

Registered Office—No. 110, Cannon Street.

The Directors offer for sale the balance of the Shares—£1 on appli-
cation and £4 one month after allotment. Applications will be dealt
with in the order of their receipt.

Calls not to exceed £2 10s. each per share, or to be made at less inter-
vals than three months, one month's notice being given. It is not ex-
pected that so much as £10 per share will be called up, but allottees
desiring to pay up in full may do so, with the consent of the Directors,
and interest at the rate of £6 per cent. per annum will be allowed on
the amounts paid in advance of calls.

Forms of Application for Shares, and the second edition of the Pro-
spectus, containing particulars of the contracts which have been entered
into, and copies of Maps and Reports and Valuations of the Properties,
and full Report of the Statutory Meeting, can be obtained on applica-
tion personally, or by post to the Secretary, 110, Cannon Street.

THE NEW ZEALAND AGRICULTURAL COMPANY, LIMITED. Issue MORTGAGE DEBENTURES at 5, 5½, and 6 PER CENT. The Company can now undertake all kinds of Agency Business and the Management of Properties in the Colony. A limited number of Cadets will be received by the Company from time to time to proceed to New Zealand to learn Sheep Farming and Agriculture. Applications to be made to the Secretary, from whom the necessary papers can be obtained.
110, Cannon-street. JOHN SCOTT CAVELL, Secretary.

UNION BANK OF AUSTRALIA.

Established 1837.
Paid-up capital £1,487,500 || Reserve fund | 753,500 |
| LETTERS OF CREDIT and BILLS on DEMAND, or at Thirty Days' Sight, are granted on the Bank's Branches throughout Australia and New Zealand. BILLS on the Colonies are negotiated and sent for collection. DEPOSITS are received, at notice, and for fixed periods, on terms which may be ascertained on application. | |

W. R. MEWBURN, Manager.

1, Bank-buildings, Lothbury, London, E.C.

LEEDS CORPORATION CONSOLIDATED

FOUR PER CENT. DEBENTURE STOCK.—Applications are invited for investment in the above security.—Full particulars may be obtained from Messrs. FREDERICK BARNBY & SONS, Bartholomew-lane, London; or Mr. Wm. DERRY, Borough Accountant, Leeds.

THE AGRA BANK (LIMITED).

Established in 1833.—Capital, £1,000,000.
HEAD OFFICE—NICHOLAS-LANE, LOMBARD-STREET, LONDON.
BRANCHES in Edinburgh, Calcutta, Bombay, Madras, Kurrachee, Agra, Lahore, Shanghai, Hong Kong.

CURRENT ACCOUNTS are kept at the Head Office on the terms cus-
tomary with London bankers, and interest allowed when the credit
balance does not fall below £100.

DEPOSITS received for fixed periods on the following terms, viz.:—
At 5 per cent. per annum, subject to 12 months' notice of withdrawal.
For shorter periods deposits will be received on terms to be agreed
upon.

BILLS issued at the current exchange of the day on any of the Branches
of the Bank free of extra charge; and approved bills purchased or sent
for collection.

SALES AND PURCHASES effected in British and foreign securities, in
East India Stock and loans, and the safe custody of the same under-
taken.

Interest drawn and army, navy, and civil pay and pensions realized.
Every other description of banking business and money agency.
British and Indian transacted. J. THOMSON, Chairman.

AN IMPORTANT CONVENIENCE TO LAW WRITERS AND SOLICITORS.

STEPHENS' SCARLET INK FOR STEEL PENS.

This new Ink supplies the demand continually made but never
before met, for a Red Ink which is unaltered by Steel or other
Metallic Pens. Steel Pens left in this ink for months do not impair
the beauty of its colour, nor are the Pens in the least corroded by it.
The existing Red Inks rapidly destroy Steel Pens, and lose their red
colour if used with other than Gold or Quill Pens. This new colour
is a very rich scarlet red of great beauty. The colour of this ink is
not affected by use upon parchment, and is consequently of great
value to Solicitors and Draughtsmen.

Sold in stone bottles, retail at 1s., 2s., 3s.; and Imperial Quarts of
Ounces at 6s. each. Also in glass bottles at 6d. and 1s. each.

LONDON GAZETTE (published by authority) and LONDON and
COUNTRY ADVERTISEMENT OFFICE.

No. 117, CHANCERY LANE, FLEET STREET.

HENRY GREEN, Advertisement Agent, begs to
direct the attention of the Legal Profession to the advantages
of his long experience of upwards of thirty years, in the special in-
sertion of all pro forma notices, &c., and hereby solicits their continued
support.—N.B. One copy of advertisement only required, and the strictest
care and promptitude assured. Officially stamped forms for advertise-
ment and file of "London Gazette" kept. By appointment.

MESSRS. DEBENHAM, TEWSON & FARMER'S

LIST OF ESTATES and HOUSES to be SOLD or LET, including
Landed Estates, Town and Country Residences, Hunting and Shooting
Quarters, Farms, Ground Rents, Rent Charges, House Property and
Investments generally, is published on the first day of each month,
and may be obtained, free of charge, at their offices, 80, Cheapside, E.C.
or will be sent by post in return for two stamps.—Particulars for inser-
tion should be received not later than four days previous to the end
of the preceding month.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY. Pure, Mild and
Mellow, Delicious and most Wholesome. Universally recom-
mended by the Profession. The Cream of Old Irish Whiskies.

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY. Dr. Hassall says—
"Soft and Mellow, Pure, well Matured, and of very excellent
quality."

KINAHAN'S LL WHISKY. Gold Medal, Paris
Exhibition, 1875; Dublin Exhibition, 1865, the Gold Medal.
20, Great Titchfield Street, London, W.

THE